DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 832 CE 026 342

TITLE	Dissemination and Utilization of Vocational Education Program Improvement Products. Phase One, October 1, 1979, through June 30, 1980.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Adult Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 80
CONTRACT	R-31-X-0434-338
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences; Delivery Systems; *Diffusion; Educational Development; Educational Improvement; Educational Research; *Efficiency; *Information Dissemination; Literature Reviews; Models; *Program Improvement; Questionnaires; Research Utilization; Surveys; Technology Transfer; Use Studies; *Vocational Education; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Phase 1 goal of a project was to provide the theoretical and methodological base for formulation of a prototype model of a comprehensive and effective system of disseminating vocational education improvement products. Major activities were divided into five categories: literature reviews, conferences and workshops, consultations, questionnaire surveys, and related activities. The literature review provided a theoretical background, knowledge of past research on dissemination, overview of characteristics of dissemination models, and a tool to identify groups and networks involved in the dissemination process. Expressed concerns and conclusions of eight conferences and workshops were to be reflected in the development of the prototype model. The staff also consulted with people working in the area of dissemination on the local level and visited Florida, an exemplary state. Two sample questionnaires were designed, mailed, and preliminarily analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of dissemination and diffusion strategies used in moving program improvement products from the development to the utilization stage. One tested the relationship between how a product is obtained and how it is used; the second tested the effectiveness of various dissemination activities relative to their desired effect. (Appendixes include a bibliography, interview form, and survey instruments.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190832

Dissemination and Utilization of Vocational Education Program Improvement Products

Phase One

Illinois State Board of Education
Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

June 30, 1980

CE 026 342

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL REPORT

Funding Agreement Number: R-31-10-X-0434-338

Project Title: Dissemination and Utilization of Vocational Education Program Improvement Products — Phase One

Grantee Organization: Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801

Time Period Covered: October 1, 1979, through June 30, 1980

PROJECT STAFF

Dr. J. Marlowe Slater
Professor
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
345 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217)333-0807

Dr. Janet Treichel
Assistant Professor
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
805 West Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217)333-7228

Ms. Ann Jung
Visiting Assistant Specialist
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
805 West Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217)333-7228

Mrs. Carol Sanders
Graduate Assistant
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
805 West Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217)333-7228

Abstract for Funding Agreement with Adult, Vocational and Technical Education

Title: Dissemination and Utilization of Vocational Education Program Improvement Products — Phase One

Project Director: Dr. J. Marlowe Slater, Professor of Vocational and Technical Education

Principal Investigator: Dr. Janet Treichel, Visiting Assistant Professor of Vocational and Technical Education

Institution: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Location: 345 Education Building, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801

Funding Period: October 1, 1979, through June 30, 1980

Objectives of Project: To determine the state of research on dissemination and formulate a working definition compatible with state dissemination activities and experiences.

Procedures of Implementation:

1. To observe and identify strategies and techniques utilized in disseminating different types of research and development program improvement outputs.
2. To observe and identify procedures necessary to evaluate effectiveness of dissemination activities.
3. To identify inservice needs and activities facilitative to the awareness and utilization of program improvement products.
4. To review the literature related to dissemination, utilization, and evaluation.

Contribution to Vocational and Technical Education:

Provide data on theoretical and practical concerns of effective, comprehensive dissemination of program improvement outputs.

Highlights of the Project

Listed below in a brief summary form are some of the major accomplishments and activities of Phase One of the project.

- Literature and other research findings relative to dissemination, utilization, and evaluation were reviewed.
- Staff members participated in a national D&U conference at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
- In conjunction with the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, a one-day conference was convened at which state staff and selected university and local education agency persons addressed D&U policy concerns.
- Staff members traveled to an exemplary state and examined its system of dissemination from the state office level to the local level.
- A D&U conference was conducted to solicit information from persons directly involved in using program improvement products or serving as linkers between product development and local utilization of products.
- A survey instrument to collect data regarding dissemination and utilization of a selected research and development product was designed and mailed to recipients of the product statewide.
- A survey instrument to collect data on effectiveness of activities associated with dissemination was designed and mailed to vocational educators nationally.
- Staff members attended workshops and conferences conducted for the purpose of disseminating curriculum products and conducted one workshop for this purpose.
- The visibility of the D&U project demonstrated Illinois' commitment to the importance and need for the formulation of a comprehensive and effective dissemination system.

THE HEART OF THE DISSEMINATION PROCESS IS THE PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL GOALS OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED . . . . C. B. Myers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction and Overview of the Project 1

II. Narrative Description of the Project 3

Staff Qualifications and Facilities 3

Rationale for the Project 4

III. Accomplishments and Major Activities 7

Objectives and Degree of Accomplishment 7

IV. Literature Review 9

Educational Change Theories 9

Dissemination Networks 11

Dissemination and Utilization 12

V. Conferences and Workshops 15

Staff Participation 15

Staff Conducted Conferences and Workshops 20

Staff Observed Workshops 27

VI. Consultations 31

Interviews 31

State of Florida Site Visit 32

Dissemin/Action 36

National Diffusion Network 37

VII. Questionnaire Surveys 41

Methods and Materials for Teaching Occupational Survival Skills (OSS) Followup Survey 41

Processes of Dissemination Survey 55

VIII. Related Activities 59

IX. Transition 63

Appendix A -- Bibliography 67

Appendix B -- Conference Summaries 73

Appendix C -- Interview Form 97

Appendix D -- Florida Site Visit Agenda 101

Appendix E -- OSS Followup Survey Instrument 105

Appendix F -- Processes of Dissemination Survey Instrument . . . 115

Appendix G -- OSS Dissemination Review in Pennsylvania 121

I INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Large amounts of money have been invested in vocational education research and development (R&D) activities by both state and federal agencies. The vulnerability of R&D output impact has been documented at the stage of dissemination. The project entitled "Dissemination and Utilization of Vocational Education Program Improvement Products," (D&U Project) was conceived out of an awareness of and the Illinois State Board of Education's concern to counteract this vulnerability. The proposal for Phase One of this project (October 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980) was formulated in response to the need to begin to devise an effective, comprehensive system of dissemination for the State of Illinois.

As originally conceptualized by project developers, Phase One of the project was to consist of the development of a model program for the dissemination and utilization of program improvement efforts in the State of Illinois and to deliver program improvement products and strategies to education professionals for incorporation in their ongoing instructional programs. The proposal for Phase One was submitted to and funding was approved by:

Research and Development Section
Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Commensurate with the overall design of evaluation being a continuous process to determine progress and provide feedback to facilitate changes in project design if necessary, it was recognized by the project staff and State staff early in the project that the objectives as originally set forth were too comprehensive for the initial phase of work. It was necessary to

assemble workable data in order to develop a successful model of dissemination. Project staff were in a position of forging a new frontier. Very little was known about the existing dissemination practices within the State. The development of a practical, working model of dissemination was approached systematically by formulating pertinent preliminary questions. Phase One project objectives were reformulated to begin to develop the data base which would respond to practical, as well as theoretical, needs of a dissemination system: (1) What is dissemination? (2) What dissemination techniques and strategies now exist? and (3) What are the elements of a comprehensive, effective system for Illinois?

Phase One was a period of laying the foundation, identifying variables and formulating methodologies. Literature was reviewed; workshops were observed for products and techniques; two survey questionnaires were designed, mailed and preliminarily analyzed; an exemplary state was visited; and two dissemination conferences were convened.

This report then, traces those first steps of breaking ground. It reflects the searching and discovery, the failures and successes involved in the formulation of an effective, comprehensive dissemination system for the State of Illinois.

II NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The mere dispersing of concepts, materials or information to educators does not assure utilization nor does it necessarily effect change in any way. It was quite evident from the beginning of the D&U Project that not enough is known about how and what kinds of R&D products individuals select for use, the purpose for which they are used, the impact and effectiveness of their use, or indeed, how the interest is engendered initially. It was found that dissemination of R&D products and innovations is for the most part, a hit and miss affair. Trial and error tactics are used to initiate contact with appropriate persons involved in the dissemination process. The principal purpose of Phase One was to provide the beginning of the end of sketchy dissemination activities; to confront head-on that which is termed the dissemination process and discover its elements, and its actors.

Staff Qualifications and Facilities

Major responsibility for the project management and the accomplishment of project objectives was assumed by the D&U Project staff. The staff consisted of: Project Director, Marlowe Slater; Principal Investigator, Janet Treichel; and two University of Illinois researchers, Ann Jung and Carol Sanders. All staff members had a commitment and interest in dissemination and extensive backgrounds in research projects.

University of Illinois project staff for this effort were housed in facilities occupied by the College of Education. All of the university facilities were available to the project staff which greatly facilitated the accomplishment of the project objectives. The resources of particular value to this project included:

-- Bureau of Educational Research, Rupert Evans, Acting Director

-- Center for Instructional Resources and Curriculum Evaluation, Robert Stake, Director

-- University of Illinois Library (catalogued collection in excess of 5½ million volumes and an uncatalogued collection of 3¼ million volumes)

-- Digital Computer Laboratory (Cyber 175 and IBM 360 technology and consultant services)

-- Survey Research Laboratory, Robert Ferber, Director

Rationale for the Project

In 1974, as followup to the establishment of vocational education research coordinating units in each state and trust territory, and the conducting of large-scale funded research projects, the United States Office of Education (USOE) asked the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to assess the impact of 250 million dollars spent by USOE on vocational education research and development activities during the ten years between 1965 and 1974. The Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development (COVERD) established by NAS in 1976 found that R&D projects conducted during that ten year period were not able to show "documented, widespread impact on the knowledge, skills or employability of large numbers of students" (IMPACT, 1979). With other national evaluations of vocational education research and development also being critical (Development Associates, 1975; Rand Corporation, 1975; Comptroller General of the United States, 1974), Congress passed the Educational Amendments of 1976. This legislation (Public Law 94-482) mandated that successful applicants for R&D contracts in vocational education must "demonstrate a reasonable probability" that the contract would result in improved teaching techniques or curriculum materials that would be used in a "substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after termination of such contracts" (Federal Register, 1977).

Spurred by legislative provisions, a pressing need appears for the development of effective systems for disseminating innovative curriculum concepts and materials which impact positively on instruction and programs for students. Unless strategies and techniques which facilitate the movement of these products into the educational milieu are identified, implemented, and tested, impact data for these funded efforts and the benefit they can have for students will not be maximized. Formulation of a prototype model of dissemination could provide a useful tool for anyone involved in the dissemination process: research and development agencies (funders); innovators of new materials, project planners and developers (developers); facilitators which link products with appropriate persons (linkers); and local practitioners who will use the information, materials, reports, or services (users).

The Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education has expressed concern through previous funded efforts for dissemination of: (1) materials which have been developed and tested; and (2) materials described by vocational education leaders as "materials which are practical, relevant, high quality, and strengthen vocational education programs." Thus, the D&U Project moves this concern and commitment to effective, comprehensive dissemination one step closer to practical reality.

III ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF THE FUNDED PERIOD

Major activities of the funded period, October 1, 1979, to June 30, 1980, can be divided into five categories: (1) literature review; (2) conferences and workshops; (3) consultations; (4) questionnaire surveys; and (5) related activities. All activities entertwined to accomplish the goal of Phase One of the D&U Project, namely, to provide the theoretical and methodological base for formulation of a prototype model of a comprehensive and effective system of disseminating vocational education improvement products.

Objectives and Degree of Accomplishment

The project proposal and subsequent consultation with Illinois State Board of Education staff identified the objectives to be achieved during the first phase of the project. The objectives of Phase One included:

-- *Identify strategies utilized in disseminating and diffusing program improvement products into local school settings.*

This objective was completed. Literature related to dissemination, change, and dissemination networks was reviewed. A conference which addressed the topic of dissemination and utilization was convened. Project staff participated in one statewide, one ten-state regional, and one national conference which addressed the topic of dissemination and utilization. Three workshops were observed noting product, dissemination strategy, and followup plans. Project staff facilitated one workshop to disseminate a state developed and tested vocational education program improvement product. Project

staff members also met with staff in Florida, an exemplary state committed to dissemination, to become familiar with efforts ongoing in other states.

-- *To evaluate the effectiveness of dissemination and diffusion strategies used in moving program improvement products from the development stage to the utilization stage.*

Names and addresses of recipients of vocational education program improvement products were assembled. Two sample questionnaire surveys were designed and mailed to two random samples from that population. One to test the relationship between how one product, Methods and Materials for Teaching Occupational Survival Skills (OSS) is obtained and how it is used (OSS Followup Survey), and one to test the effectiveness of dissemination activities (Processes of Dissemination Survey). A sample of each survey is included in Appendices E and F respectively. Both have been preliminarily analyzed with analysis continuing into Phase Two of the project.

-- *To identify through a sample interview process, inservice needs and activities facilitative to the utilization of program improvement products at the local district level.*

Interviews with educators working at the local level were initiated to probe their concerns, needs and experiences with the dissemination process. After five interviews project staff deemed these interviews unproductive. Questions related to this objective were included and analyzed in the OSS Followup Survey which provided more conclusive evidence regarding inservice preferences and concerns.

The following sections describe in greater detail the five major categories of activities performed by D&U Project staff. These sections explain the purpose of the project and summarize the conclusions to be drawn from the project relative to Phase One D&U Project goals.

IV LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature for this first phase of project work focused on three major areas: (1) educational change theories, (2) dissemination networks, and (3) dissemination and utilization. A bibliography comprising works on all of these areas is presented in Appendix A.

The reviewed literature provided project staff with a theoretical background, a knowledge of past research on dissemination, an overview of characteristics of dissemination models, and a tool with which to identify groups and networks involved in the dissemination process.

Educational Change Theories

While it is recognized that, especially in recent decades, change in the educational system occurs slowly, educators must not be so accepting of this situation that it impedes efforts to reassess and improve educational programs. It appears that the resistance to change can be countered by well-planned strategies and techniques. Change seems most apt to occur when thoughtful future-oriented educators recognize the need for change and when they seek ways to facilitate change in the educational setting in which they work. The path across the bridge from theory to practice is a tedious one requiring adaptions and special considerations for the uniqueness of individual local school districts and for different program goals.

To utilize research and development efforts for program improvement implies that educational change must take place. The concern becomes one of "who" or what" is most instrumental and effective in bringing about that change.

John Grange recognizes a common trap in the area of educational research. He observes that once a research project has been completed and the findings published, it is customary for most researchers to consider their role completed. Public or semi-public educational institutions are then expected to assume the burden of implementation with their resources and their control of the mechanisms for implementation (Gange, 1962). Hull notes that the responsibility for the use of research and development products has not been accepted by either the researcher or the practitioner. The researcher tends to lose interest after the study is completed, and practitioners frequently question the relevance of the research and development product (1977).

Change is an action of continuing development from creation to consequences. Part of the process of change is the sub-process, diffusion, the steps necessary to move an idea or discovery into everyday practice. Fundamental to the successful operation of diffusion is dissemination of information. The author(s) of the Dissemination System of the Idaho Department of Education (1978) identify dissemination as an integral component in the process of change. They state that there can be neither improvement nor progress without some form of change.

The literature identifies three theoretical models of diffusion and change (Havelock, 1971; Hall and Alford, 1976; Kim, 1978). The National Institute of Education (NIE) Dissemination and Resources Group (1978) directed their efforts toward communication models which aid in the dissemination of educational knowledge emphasizing operational problems of dissemination. Authors' conceptions of all of these models are similar, however, a closer examination reveals distinctions pertinent to the current D&U Project activities. Two main controversies are delineated, namely, who is responsible for a successful dissemination activity--funder, developer, linker, or user; and what is the

best mode of R&D product dissemination. Out of this controversy comes the need for cooperation and collaboration among all dissemination actors and the necessity of different strategies to insure successful utilization of various R&D program improvement products.

Dissemination Networks

A review of the literature on dissemination networks revealed three aspects pertinent to D&U Project activities. First, project staff learned of many dissemination networks which function at both the state and national levels. As a result, project staff had the opportunity for formal and informal contact with these networks and much of this information was compiled in the form of a resource folder for distribution (See "Staff Conducted Conferences and Workshops"). Although these dissemination networks address different audiences, and cover various topics, their common mission is to facilitate the dissemination of R&D outputs: information; reports; materials; and services.

The fact that these networks had to be "discovered" lends credence to the hypothesis of a large number of authors writing on dissemination networks that the vast majority of educators are not aware of the existence and availability of these networks much less the services they provide (Bain and Groseclose, 1979; Frey, 1979). This lack of awareness of existing networks was further evidenced by various project activities (See "Staff Conducted Conferences and Workshops" and "Interviews").

Apart from the lack of practitioner awareness of existing dissemination networks, literature reveals a further problem of lack of coordination, cooperation and communication among networks (Hull, 1977; Magisos, 1979; Bain

and Groseclose, 1979). Again what is called for is an interaction between and among all actors involved in the dissemination process.

Dissemination and Utilization

Because the improvement of dissemination is a top research and development priority in Illinois, a working definition of dissemination is needed. Perhaps the most important aspect of the review of the D&U literature was determining an operational definition of dissemination.

The authors of the 1978 Dissemination Forum--Final Report note that there is a problem concerning the image of dissemination. There is a widespread lack of understanding of its nature. Many feel that dissemination is a trivial step in educational improvement; that it is handled by offices of public relations (OE, NIE, NCES, 1978). Yet, ironically, 208 federal laws mandate the improvement of dissemination, and dissemination has been declared a top educational priority.

The Interstate Project on Dissemination (IPOD) in 1976 made eight policy recommendations relative to dissemination activities to NIE. Spurred by the IPOD Report, the Dissemination Analysis Group (DAG) provided the Dissemination Policy Council of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) with a comprehensive analysis of dissemination problems in a report entitled: "Dissemination in Relation to Elementary and Secondary Education." The DAG report enumerates a four-level definition of dissemination which is included in a "Statement of Agreement by Professionals in the Field of Education Dissemination" passed at the second National Dissemination Forum in Arlington, Virginia, 1978. The Forum participants adopted the following DAG definition of dissemination "...as a means of providing a common base for all those who would undertake the development of the Nationwide Dissemination Configuration:" (NIE, 1978).

Level 1: Spread: The one-way casting out of knowledge in all forms: information, products, ideas and materials, "as though sowing seeds."

Level 2: Exchange: The two-way or multi-way flow of information, products, ideas and materials as to needs, problems, and potential solutions.

Level 3: Choice: The facilitation of rational consideration and selection among those ideas, materials, outcomes of research and development, effective educational practices and other knowledge that can be used for the improvement of education.

Level 4: Implementation: The facilitation of adoption, installation and the ongoing utilization of improvements.

(DAG, 1977)

The DAG recognizes that various definitions for the term dissemination have been used. However, the DAG definition: (1) is consistent with the definition in the IPOD report; (2) represents the most common public use of the term; (3) is directly applicable to the use of the term dissemination in the legislation; and (4) is particularly helpful in planning or describing ongoing dissemination activities. This four-level, DAG definition which includes the concept of utilization, was adopted by the D&U Project.

For program improvement to occur, dissemination of research and development outputs is essential. Previously, once a research project was completed and the findings were published or a product was produced, project directors tended to consider their role completed. Data indicate that many project directors are not familiar with various techniques and methods that could be utilized in developing effective dissemination activities. Developers too often interpret dissemination as "telling" (primarily via print media) and too seldom undertake the helping, training, and/or involvement that is necessary if their developments are to be implemented (Smith, Arkell, and Allen, 1980). Too often dissemination efforts consist of the first level

(spread) of the DAG definition. A need is identified for early development of dissemination plans which take into consideration intended target audiences, product content and format, evaluation, field testing, marketing, and effective dissemination activities appropriate for intended outcomes of funded projects. Project directors need assistance in developing these plans; for, as noted, different outcomes warrant different techniques.

A further finding in the D&U literature pertinent to the D&U Project activities is the use of existing networks and agencies in the dissemination process. The DAG's vision of the future is directed toward the improvement of dissemination to practitioners in elementary and secondary public schools. Their conceptual framework deals with three levels: the state, the region, and the nation. "Insofar as possible, each state system would build on existing strengths and established activities of the groups and agencies involved" (DAG, 1977). As mentioned, Illinois has a number of existing networks/agencies which engage in educational dissemination to local school districts. The D&U Project has adopted the DAG vision and is committed to the formulation of a dissemination system designed and managed in a fashion that is unique to the particular conditions and existing structure in Illinois. This includes the use of existing networks/agencies to facilitate dissemination of R&D program improvement products.

V CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

A large portion of the D&U Project activities centered around conferences and workshops. Content of these conferences and workshops varied as did project staff involvement. In all, project staff either observed, participated in, or conducted eight conferences and workshops in the Phase One funding period. Following is a summary of each workshop and conference which outlines purpose, participants, sponsor, date, time, place, activities, general conclusions and followup activities. The expressed concerns and conclusions of these conference and workshop activities will be reflected in the development of the prototype model and recommendations by the D&U staff to the Illinois State Board of Education in Phase Two of the project.

Staff Participation

D&U Project staff were invited to participate in three conferences focusing on dissemination: one national; one ten-state regional; and one state-wide.

Title: *National Vocational Education D&U Conference*
Sponsor: *The National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE)*
Date: *October 9-11, 1979*
Location: *The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio*

Concerned about distribution of R&D program improvement products, the NCRVE staff at The Ohio State University, use the four-level operational definition of dissemination outlined by the Dissemination Analysis Group (DAG) of the Dissemination Policy Council. They state that too often disseminators fail to achieve impact with their work because they rely too heavily on only one level of dissemination or fail to carry it through to implementation (Magisos, 1979).

The diffusion of R&D-based products and information by the NCRVE were initially distributed by the method identified as the first level of dissemination, "spread." Products and information were distributed to prime audiences and sold on a cost-recovery basis. When it became apparent that this effort did not result in true dissemination, extensive printing was discontinued and resources were directed toward dissemination planning and awareness activities (Hull, Magisos and Singer, 1978). The current diffusion program of the National Center focuses on five USOE sponsored projects, and places programmatic emphasis on systematic, continuous approaches to the dissemination of nationally significant products and information from diverse sources. Major emphasis has been on collaboration with other organizations, principally the state research coordinating units (RCUs), regional curriculum coordination centers (CCCs), and state liaison representatives (SLRs) for curriculum (Hull, Magisos and Singer, 1978). The NCRVE has held a number of conferences with these groups. The Second Annual National Vocational Education D&U conference was one such conference.

The NCRVE sponsored the meeting for the purpose of improving program support services in vocational education. The conference provided an opportunity for participants to provide input into the continuing development and refinement of a network to achieve dissemination and utilization of vocational education R&D outputs. The two-day conference was attended by state and regional representatives: RCU directors, curriculum center coordinators, liaison representatives, consultants from state education agencies and directors of projects, product developers, USOE/Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education staff, and NCRVE staff.

The overall conference objective was to provide planning and training activities for participants to gain:

1. A strengthened role to play in a nationwide dissemination and utilization network;
2. Refined procedures and criteria for selection of best products for dissemination;
3. First-hand knowledge and training in use of second-year product selection; and
4. Mechanisms to develop or enhance communication (information services) within participants' states.

The program agenda called for large and small group presentations, small group activities, and a panel discussion. Participants were assigned to teams consisting of a cross section of conference attendees for small group activities. Activity goals were to:

1. Identify and clarify goals for the nationwide network of D&U collaborators;
2. Explore and portray the evolving roles, responsibilities, and relationships of RCUs/CCCs/NCRVE in the D&U network;
3. Become familiar with and exchange dissemination ideas about resources which address vocational education priority areas;
4. Develop operational procedures/guidelines for a nationwide D&U network;
5. Relate field-based observations;
6. Assess available resources and levels of articulation for D&U in the state;
7. Identify other National Center projects and products which have implications for RCUs/CCCs/SLRs;
8. Develop understanding about the multi-state, multi-year plans underway for R&D;
9. Synthesize the outcomes of the conference; and
10. Summarize and evaluate the conference.

Generally, participants left the conference with one major thought: It is important to resist the temptation to make dissemination an end in itself. Dissemination efforts lead to the goal of program improvement and program improvement is the route to solving the problems inherent in vocational education.

Title: *Dissemination/Utilization Meeting*
Sponsor: *Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section*
Date: *November 27, 1979*
Location: *Sheraton Inn, Springfield, Illinois*

The Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education has made dissemination a top educational priority. In conjunction with this commitment the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section sponsored a one day meeting with a dual purpose: (1) to prepare policy recommendations on the dissemination of program improvement products developed through the Research and Development Section for consideration by the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education Administrative Council; and (2) solicit input on dissemination and utilization of program improvement products for the D&U Project. Individuals attending this meeting included: Catherine Batsche; Fran Boyd; Rebecca Douglass; Richard Hofstrand; Lauren Housel; Nona Janssen; Ronald McCage; Gene Miller; Robert Nelson; Steve Pollack; Peggy Pool; William Reynolds; Carol Sanders; Peter Seidman; Janet Treichel; John Washburn; and Jack Williams.

The summary report of the meeting and agenda are included in Appendix B. One of the most beneficial outcomes of the meeting for the D&U Project was the identification of different products for dissemination and the dissemination grid which brings to the forefront the practical application of various dissemination techniques for different products. A further benefit was the verbalization of elements needed to be addressed in the formulation of a dissemination model for vocational education program improvement products.

Title: *Improving Effectiveness of Demonstration Products*
Sponsor: *Development Associates, Inc.*
Date: *May 21-22, 1980*
Location: *Nashville, Tennessee*

This workshop was one of a series hosted by Development Associates, Inc., to disseminate Vocational Education Demonstrations: Measuring Impact and Improving Effectiveness, a monograph developed as a result of a contract with the USOE. The monograph was designed to assist project planners, implementers, disseminators, internal and third-party evaluators and funding agency monitors in improving and measuring the effectiveness of vocational education demonstration projects.

Twenty-five workshop participants attended, representing ten states. Workshop content consisted of familiarizing the participants with the contents of the monograph. This was accomplished through four exercises which related to a simulation, "Demonstration of the Solar Energy Curriculum Model." Small groups of four to five individuals acted as a team of state planners charged with various responsibilities regarding the solar energy project. Each of the four activities dealt with one aspect of the solar energy project. Team members were asked to react to a series of questions that pertained to each of the four aspects. After exchanging ideas for thirty to forty-five minutes

(per activity) each team reported their ideas to the large group for discussion purposes. Workshop leaders led the discussions and provided input regarding the monograph along with comments and ideas of past workshop participants.

The exercises were titled:

1. Interim Acceptable Evidence
2. Final Acceptable Evidence
3. Preparation of Project GANTT Chart
4. RFP Preparation

Staff Conducted Conferences and Workshops

D&U Project staff conducted one conference on dissemination and utilization and facilitated one workshop to disseminate a vocational education product, Methods and Materials for Teaching Occupational Survival Skills (OSS).

Title: *D&U Conference*
Sponsor: *D&U Project, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.*
Date: *February 25, 1980*
Location: *Urbana, Illinois*

Letters of invitation were sent to thirty-three vocational teachers, three phase evaluation team members, vocational directors, regional administrators, project directors, university liaison officers, superintendents of educational service regions, representatives from career guidance centers, regional offices, area vocational centers, adult education service centers, the Illinois Project for Educational Replication and career education centers. The purpose of the meeting was to solicit information from those directly involved in using program improvement products or those in the position of suggesting materials to others regarding concerns and techniques relative to effective dissemination procedures. Twenty-three persons accepted the invitation. A narrative summary of conference and post-conference activities

follows. The agenda, group summaries of conference activities and participant list are included in Appendix B.

Narrative Summary of D&U Conference Activities

The morning of Monday, February 25, 1980, brought the worst snowstorm of the winter to Central Illinois. As the Dissemination and Utilization Conference was a one-day meeting with participants driving to the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign campus from within a fifty mile radius, many persons who had planned to attend were victims of the weather and unable to participate. A modified version of the day's activities was sent to these people (see Appendix B for the group summary and list of respondents to this version). Although four small group tables were anticipated (five to six members each), participants were consolidated and sat in two groups distinguished by the name of a color (yellow and orange). Participants' job titles included: university liaison council members; director of adult education; consultants; career guidance center coordinator; project director; assistant manager of a Program Service Team; Work Experience Career Exploration Program (WECEP) teacher/coordinator; and director of vocational education.

The conference was held in Room 322 of the Illini Union. Janet Treichel, principal investigator of the D&U Project began introductory remarks explaining the project and purpose of the conference at approximately 9:30 a.m. (one half hour late to accomodate those who may have been delayed by the storm). Ronald D. McCage, Manager of the Illinois State Board of Education Research and Development Section, elaborated on the rationale of convening such a conference in his opening remarks. Taking off from the vocational education titles of the Education Amendments of 1976, McCage discussed the federal and state provisions and requirements for funding leading to program improvement and a

Research Coordinating Council. McCage listed dissemination within the scope of the definition of coordination.

Janet Treichel introduced the first activity as a data-gathering exercise. Information networks sheets were distributed by group facilitators, Nona Janssen, Illinois State Board of Education D&U Project contract administrator, and Project staff members, Ann Jung, and Carol Sanders, to all participants. Recognizing that there are several parts of the dissemination system in Illinois which serve various groups and that participants represented a diverse group, and as such, would have differing familiarity and use of agencies engaged in the dissemination process, each participant was given time to record their individual awareness and past use of the agencies listed on the sheet. The purpose of the activity was to act as an aid in viewing the big picture of what is going on right now in terms of familiarity and use of networks involved in dissemination.

During a fifteen minute break participants were encouraged to peruse a table which had been set up to display examples of output produced through the Illinois State Board of Education. After the break participants returned to their small group tables and were asked:

> *As a person involved with R&D program improvement outputs, you have been asked to develop a dissemination system that would effectively meet your needs. What are your three (3) most important needs that this effective dissemination system would meet?*

Three blue index cards were distributed to each individual and they were given time to write one need on each card. Beginning from the number one, the members of each group counted off. Number two was designated chairperson and number four the recorder/reporter. All the cards were passed to the chairperson and the recorder wrote down each group member's three needs on a flipchart. Discussion then ensued regarding clarification of specific needs,

combination of needs, etc. Each group then narrowed their needs to five and put them in priority order. The two groups came together to report on their respective prioritization of needs. All individual needs and the groups' five priority needs were recorded on blue "Group Summary" sheets.

Participants then broke for lunch which was served in the Illini Union Ballroom.

After lunch participants returned once again to their small groups and were asked:

> *Recall the previous activity and your group's five priority need areas of an effective dissemination system.*
>
> *Identify two (2) strategies or techniques that could be used to meet each of the five priority need areas.*

Five yellow index cards were distributed to each individual and they were given time to write two techniques on each of the five cards and label which priority was being addressed. Beginning with the number one, members of each group counted off. Number one was designated chairperson and number five the recorder/reporter. All the cards were passed to the chairperson and the recorder wrote down each group member's techniques under the appropriate need priority on a flipchart. Discussion then ensued regarding clarification and combination of techniques and pinpointing techniques which may merit special attention or highlighting. The two groups came together to report on their techniques and strategies for priority needs. All techniques and strategies were recorded on yellow "Group Summary" sheets.

Groups began the fourth and final activity of the day after a fifteen minute break. Back in small groups participants were given an "Identification of D&U Strategies for R&D Product Sheet". This sheet was adapted from the state meeting on dissemination and utilization convened in Springfield in November 1979. It presented the NIE Dissemination Analysis Group definitions

of the four levels of dissemination and displayed a grid whereby different categories of research and development output could be matched with different level(s) of dissemination. As the sheet (and the display table of examples of research and development output) indicated, there are numerous kinds of research and development outputs which may require different methods of dissemination. Participants were given time to fill in their grids individually, indicating the most effective level(s) of dissemination for each item of output.

Participants were then given the task of coming to a small group concensus and person number six, appointed the recorder, rated the group response on a grid summary sheet.

Although the closing of major arteries out of the city due to bad weather made participants a most "captive" audience, Janet Treichel closed the conference and offered thanks to all participants at 4:15 p.m. Those unable to return to their homes remained in town overnight. A full summary report of the conference was subsequently mailed to all participants.

In conjunction with the D&U Conference a folder containing brochures, maps, resources, and services of information networks across the state was compiled as a handout for each participant. Folders contained information on the following networks/agencies which have a common mission to facilitate dissemination of vocational education program improvement products throughout the State of Illinois.

1. State Board of Education/Illinois Office of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
2. Career Guidance Centers
3. Program Services Teams
4. Work Industry Education Labor Councils
5. Gifted Area Service Centers
6. Illinois Centers for Educational Improvement
7. Educational Service Regions

8. Adult Education Service Centers
9. Illinois State Board of Education/Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Consultant Services Section Staff
10. Regional Vocational Education Administrators
11. Career Education Service Centers
12. Occupational Education University Liaison Council
13. Education/CETA Linkages Project
14. Illinois Teacher Centers
15. Displaced Homemaker Projects
16. Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network (IRDN)
17. Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse
18. Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network
19. ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Clearinghouse on Adult, Vocational and Career Education
20. East Central Curriculum Management Center (ECCMC)
21. National Diffusion Network (NDN), Illinois Statewide Facilitator Center

Folders were distributed to the sixteen conference attendees, and the twelve individuals who had planned to attend the conference but could not. In addition, folders were distributed to those persons participating in the D&U interview activity after the conference date. In response to a personal request by the Chairperson of the Vocational and Technical Education Department at the University of Illinois, ten copies were delivered to his office for the purpose of distribution to faculty members.

Because response was so positive to these folders, an additional 300 copies were assembled. Future distribution of these information folders will take place in Phase Two of D&U Project funding. A continuous list of folder recipients is maintained by the D&U Project. The intent is to update the folders periodically and distribute the information to recipients to facilitate the use of the folder as a current informational resource.

Title: *Occupational Survival Skills Workshop*
Sponsor: *Region 12 Career Guidance Center*
Date: *February 18, 1980*
Location: *Lake Land Community College, Mattoon, Illinois*

Jerry Zachary, Director, and the Region 12 Career Guidance Center staff

organized and hosted the OSS Workshop at Lake Land Community College on February 18, 1980. D&U Project staff members, Janet Treichel, Carol Sanders, and Ann Jung acted as facilitators.

The workshop began at 1:15 p.m. in a tiered lecture hall at the college. Participants numbered 35 and represented a diverse group of job responsibilities: high school counselors; high school career education teachers; special education teachers; pre-vocational counselors; corrections vocational counselors; CETA project coordinators; community college counselors; individualized learning coordinators; high school principal; adult basic education counselor; and university vocational education professors. A list of participants' names and addresses was compiled and is being kept on file.

Following introductory remarks, Carol Sanders gave a general overview of the OSS materials outlining the historical development of the materials, research that went into them, and previous users. One module, Authority and Responsibility, was highlighted to point out the features and organization of each module. A bibliography from the OSS Project by Robert E. Nelson was distributed as an informational handout to all participants.

Each group was given time to study the chosen topic and to discuss the materials relative to:

1. What is the importance of this topic to their students - why is it important?
2. How do the major goals of the topic relate to the students served?
3. Which portions of the materials would they adopt or adapt that they feel would be particularly relevant to their students? If they would adapt portions, what kind of adaptations would be made?
4. How and where does this topic fit in with the ongoing instructional program - other subject matter areas?
5. Which followup activities are of particular value to the topic presented and how might they use them or adapt them for use with their students?
6. What additional activities would they suggest (or perhaps they have used) for the topic?

Each group reported to the total group for about five minutes on the module and topic that was studied. After each presentation a few minutes were allocated for specific questions from members of the other groups. After all the presentations were finished, general discussion on the materials and the four modules ensued.

"Additional Topic" forms were distributed and each participant was asked for their suggestions regarding additional topics within the module with which they had worked.

All participants then returned to the lecture hall where they received a set of the OSS materials and completed an evaluation form formulated and collected by the Career Guidance Center staff. The workshop ended at 4 p.m. as scheduled.

Staff Observed Workshops

Three workshops were attended by D&U Project staff members for the purpose of observing dissemination of different products, through various methods. These workshops provided project staff members with firsthand knowledge of dissemination activities within the state. The workshops also aided in the identification of products, techniques, and evaluative data needed for Phase Two project activities. A problem associated with this project activity was D&U Project staff awareness of dissemination activities taking place throughout the state. Learning about these workshops was a hit and miss affair. Project staff experience cemented even more firmly the notion of collaboration among funder, developer, linker and user in the dissemination process.

Title: *Illinois Special Needs Populations Workshop*
Sponsor: *Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network*
Date: *March 20, 1980*
Location: *Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois*

This workshop was one of a series conducted in different areas throughout the state. It was a two-day workshop but D&U Project staff members attended only the second day sessions. Presentations were made to approximately 50 persons working in some capacity with special needs learners in both full and small group sessions. Large group presentations given in lecture format centered on Non-Traditional Occupational Placement and the Special Needs Learner and Mini-Grants and the RFA Process. A film was also shown to the large group. Three small group sessions provided for distribution of two resource guides (one facilitated by a user of the guide, one facilitated by the developer of the guide) and a teacher training slide tape program.

Title: *Vocational Resource Dissemination Workshop*
Sponsor: *VRD Project, Johnsburg High School*
Date: *April 16, 1980*
Location: *Holiday Inn, Decatur, Illinois*

Project staff members Carol Sanders and Ann Jung attended this workshop, also one of a series organized and conducted throughout the state, to disseminate curriculum guides for the construction trades, graphic arts, and health occupations. Participants were divided by chosen vocational field. Morning sessions concentrated on presentation of the guide while the afternoon was devoted to problem solving. One user and two developers of the guides facilitated the groups. Occupational consultants from the Illinois State Board of Education were in attendance providing information on rules and regulations for teacher qualifications, the East Central Curriculum Management Center, particular materials housed in the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse, and

membership in the Illinois Vocational Association. Project Director, Steve Pollack also provided tips on community involvement and equipment acquisition. Gene Miller of the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse attended with an all day exhibit for perusal and interaction.

Pollack plans to mail a followup letter in March 1981, to participants who attended these workshops. The D&U Project hopes to collaborate with his project in the formulation of the followup letter to facilitate data gathering activities in Phase Two of the project.

Title: *Regional Counselor's Workshop*
Sponsor: *Career Guidance Center Region 11*
Date: *April 25, 1980*
Location: *Country Inn Restaurant, Urbana, Illinois*

Project staff member Ann Jung attended this inservice workshop with approximately fifty career guidance counselors from Iroquois, Vermillion, Livingston, Champaign, and Ford counties. Large group presentations on interest inventories in career guidance and the Career Planning and Pre-Employment Skills Program Guide for High School Students were offered. Each participant chose to participate in two round table discussions on either interest inventories, using the program guide in high schools, using the program guide in adult education/CETA programs, approaches to elementary school career awareness, or educational equity guidelines. A cassette tape was shown and a panel discussion on non-traditional careers for women was conducted with career persons from the community. A materials display was offered at the end of the day.

VI CONSULTATIONS

A number of activities carried out by the D&U Project staff involved individual conversations with people working in the area of dissemination or persons in the position to relate their dissemination experiences on the local level.

Interviews

In partial fulfillment of the Phase One objective, to identify inservice needs and activities facilitative to the utilization of program improvement products at the local district level, a personal interview questionnaire (30-45 minutes) was formulated (see Appendix C for sample interview form). A list of possible contact persons was accumulated through a review of ECCMC frequent users, Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse frequent users, and Kenneth Knell, Region 4 Vocational Education Administrator.

After five interviews* were conducted, Project staff evaluated the interview activity and found this process was neither efficient nor dependable in obtaining the information sought. Interviewers (Project staff) found themselves prompting for responses, putting words in interviewees' mouths. A review of interview responses revealed problems that could not be solved by a mere revision of the interview form. Responses reflected a general lack of knowledge of how to obtain materials and of the information and assistance services provided by dissemination networks. The D&U Project found it had put the horse before the cart and learned awareness of dissemination must first

*Interviewees comprised three vocational education directors, one superintendent, and one vocational education teacher.

occur before discussion could ensue. Interviewers took the opportunity afforded by these sessions to inform interviewees about the various networks/agencies and RFA and RFP procedures.

Interviewees themselves verbalized a need for information awareness and a visible, active linker to be able to recommend products or direct a practitioner to an appropriate contact person. They cited "word of mouth" as the current practice to get information and the importance of a "vibrant" personality to fill disseminator roles. Administrative support was also cited as necessary for true dissemination success.

Thus, this activity provided bold evidence of a need for sponsorship of dissemination awareness activities to reach people on a larger scale. In response, this need has been identified as an objective for Phase Two of project funding.

State of Florida Site Visit

Dunham (1979) and Fletcher (1977) feel that dissemination is a state responsibility. Dunham indicated in a presentation at the National Research Coordinating Unit (RCU) Director's Conference in 1979 that states are expected to carry the bulk of the dissemination responsibilities within the nationwide network of dissemination. Florida is one state that has assumed that responsibility.

In 1975 the Florida Department of Education underwent a major reorganization. The Vocational Education Department began looking at the materials that had been developed with state funds to determine what was being used and what was sitting on the shelf. At that time the decision was made that henceforth and forevermore there would be a major emphasis placed on dissemination and diffusion within the Bureau of Research, Dissemination and Evaluation.

Florida has developed a dissemination and diffusion model consisting of a five-step process: (1) awareness, (2) interest, (3) trial, (4) decision, and (5) implementation. The process is general and adaptable to a variety of situations. In many cases segments of the process can be eliminated for products or activities that do not require full treatment. The process is geared to diffusion planning and does not necessarily describe the actual stages a developer may go through within his or her own mind (State of Florida, 1978).

When the project proposal for Phase One was developed, the D&U Project staff identified a need to become familiar with dissemination systems and efforts that were ongoing in other states. As a result, one trip to another state was included as an activity in Phase One. Important considerations in selecting a state for visitation was that the state: (1) bear some similarity to Illinois in terms of emphasis at the state level for systematic dissemination of products and programs; (2) have an established dissemination system that had been operational long enough to document its track record; and (3) have some geographic characteristics common to Illinois relative to centers of population and location of state office outside the major metropolitan area. The state of Florida appeared to fit these criteria and was thus selected for a site visit.

On October 9-11, 1980, while attending the National Vocational Education D&U Conference at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, project staff talked with Virginia Bert, Director of Vocational Education Research and Development, and Margaret Ferqueron, Bureau Chief for Vocational Education Research, Dissemination, and Evaluation, about scheduling the impending visit during the early part of 1980.

A followup telephone conversation with Bert confirmed the dates of February 4-6, 1980, for the visit. However, during the intervening time, Bert

assumed new responsibilities in the Department of Education and was no longer associated with the Research and Development Section. Thus, further discussions regarding the visit and arrangements for the two and one-half day meeting were held with Stan Simpson, Director of the Dissemination and Diffusion Section.

As a result of a series of telephone conversations between the project principal investigator and Simpson, the agenda items and time frames were established (see Appendix C). Project staff members Janet Treichel and Carol Sanders, and Ronald D. McCage, Manager, Illinois State Board of Education/ Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, traveled to Tallahassee, Florida, for the meeting.

The first half-day of the visit was spent in conference with Ferqueron and her staff. An overview and historical perspective of the dissemination and diffusion process and its place within the total Research, Dissemination, and Evaluation Bureau was provided. This enabled Illinois D&U Project staff to meet and interact with the persons who had management responsibilities for dissemination at various levels within the state agency.

The remainder of the day was spent with Simpson and his dissemination and diffusion staff. This time was devoted to discussing the mechanics of Florida's dissemination efforts from the time of funding through the distribution of a product or program and subsequent inservice sessions. The dissemination and diffusion staff, in cooperation with the project director develop a "dissemination plan" early on in every project that is funded with research and development funds. This plan consists of their five-step process and identifies the strategies and techniques to be employed in the dissemination process and target audiences for the product or any part thereof. The

format for this planning system and examples of previously prepared plans were shared with the Illinois D&U Project staff.

A key element of the vocational education curriculum development and dissemination efforts in Florida is the establishment and continued funding of the Center for Studies in Vocational Education. The Center is affiliated with Florida State University and funded by the Florida Vocational Education Department. It employs 30 professional and 60 support staff. The Center provides several services to the state agency: (1) conducts needs assessments of local education agency teachers; (2) determines priorities for curriculum development; (3) searches for existing materials; (4) provides information search and retrieval services for local teachers throughout the state; (5) develops curriculum materials; (6) provides input into dissemination and diffusion plans developed for state funded projects; (7) conducts workshops on materials using a "trainer of trainer model" for state occupational consultants; (8) assumes major responsibility for packaging and marketing materials produced with state funds; and (9) publishes the Florida Vocational Education Journal. The morning of the second day was spent visiting the Center, talking with Robert Lathrop, Director of the Center, and meeting with other persons on his staff.

Florida is divided into five regions for the purpose of providing consultant services and technical assistance in each of the vocational areas to local education agencies. Each region is staffed with a regional director and one occupational consultant in each vocational area. Tuesday afternoon Treichel and Sanders met with L. Warren Harrell, Region 1 Director, and his staff of regional occupational consultants. This time was spent discussing the occupational consultant's "linker" role in the dissemination process.

The final half-day of the visit provided an opportunity to visit a local site, the Lively Vocational-Technical School. This meeting enabled project staff to gain insight into how state-directed dissemination activities are perceived by staff at the local level.

Following the visit to Florida, Treichel, McCage, and Sanders met to summarize the discussions held with the Florida Department of Education staff. It was the concensus that the trip had been a most worthwhile activity and that several successful practices ongoing in Florida could be adapted to Illinois and incorporated in the total dissemination system. Some of the practices deemed appropriate for adaptation in Illinois will be included in suggestions and recommendations made by D&U Project staff in their report to the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education early in Phase Two of the project.

All three persons agreed that based upon the success of the Florida trip and the knowledge gained, the staff would benefit from a visit to another state that has also made a strong commitment to dissemination as an educational priority. Thus, a site visit has been included in the proposal for Phase Two of the Project.

Dissemin/Action

Dissemin/Action is one of five projects of national significance sponsored by the Division of Personnel Preparation, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Carter Allen, a representative of Dissemin/Action made a presentation and held a discussion at the Leadership Training Institute project directors' meeting held at the University Inn in Champaign, Illinois, April 14, 1980. The 45 minute awareness session was attended by D&U Project staff members. Since there were only a few other attendees the time provided an opportunity for more

indepth, specific discussion with Allen regarding D&U Project goals and methods.

Dissemin/Action was sponsored to help personnel preparation projects in special education to: demonstrate the effect of their practices; determine the readiness of these practices for adoption or adaption by others; and to disseminate these practices to fill existing inservice and preservice needs. Dissemin/Action acts as a linker; the staff see themselves as identifiers of other networks that already exist. They have researched and issued a number of reports on: the educational developer as change agent; demonstration of effectiveness; and a prototype for determining the readiness of a practice for adoption or adaption. They also operate a project clearinghouse and issue a newsletter. The D&U Project has secured a number of their reports and interest has been generated to further investigate research currently being carried out by Judy Smith of the organization on information regarding the matching of particular products and strategies.

National Diffusion Network

The National Diffusion Network (NDN) was established by the U S. Office of Education of 1974 to act as a system through which the nation's school systems could be kept abreast of successfully demonstrated exemplary programs supported by federal research and development funds under Title III of the ESEA of 1965. Their basic function was, and remains, to assist interested school districts to acquire, through training, the competencies necessary to adopt or adapt a proven educational program. A program must be deemed exemplary by a Joint Dissemination Review panel. It must be replicable and of sufficient magnitude to have educational impact. Such programs are compiled annually in a catalog by the NDN entitled Educational Programs That Work. The strategy requires the developers of successful programs to train teachers and

and other staff members in their program after a commitment from the local educational agency (LEA) has been made to adopt the program. Training may also be done by "turnkey" trainers, those adopters who have adequately replicated the program and are certified by the developer to carry out the training function. Statewide facilitators of the NDN work directly with school districts, intermediate service agencies, and state departments of education to assist in identification of appropriate programs and facilitate the awareness of the networks and its services, the developer training, and program adoption.

Aware of the NDN and its mission, the D&U Project staff felt it necessary and beneficial to meet with the Illinois Statewide Facilitators and discuss the Illinois project organization, their coordination with other networks in Illinois, and services they provide to LEAs. Accordingly, D&U Project staff members met in Metropolis, Illinois, with Director Shirley Menendez and Assistant Director Nancy Farr, on May 28, 1980.

The project in Illinois has been funded since 1974 by USOE. Funding application was annual, but FY 81 begins a four year funding commitment. The staff presently consists of one full-time and one two-thirds time staff persons. There are no regional offices but, apart from travel inconveniences, they do not feel their location, the extreme southern border of the state, is a detriment. In fact, from a "change agent" point of view, it is often an asset due to the objective, outsider image they are able to reflect. They also gain flexibility because their funds do not come from the state.

The Illinois NDN works in close cooperation with the Title I and Title IV, ESEA Section of the Illinois State Board of Education. They are in close contact with both the Program Services Team and the Illinois Centers for Educational Improvement. The project organization of the Illinois NDN is similar to that in other states. Coordination between states is informal, often sharing

information of developers' travel itineraries. The example was cited that a developer from California traveling to the East Coast will often call the Illinois NDN and schedule a stop. The commonalities of mission and method are noted to be the strength of the NDN.

Typically, a LEA will contact the NDN directly or through an intermediary (Program Services Team, Illinois Center for Educational Improvement) and express the need for a particular program. The statewide facilitator goes through the NDN program catalog and the Wings of Progress (an exemplary state program catalog issued annually by the Title IV, ESEA Illinois Demonstration Network) with the LEA and, with the help of brochures, audiovisuals, etc., a program is determined. The program is approved, an adoption agreement is signed, and the developer (or turnkey) is scheduled to do the technical training. The developer's travel expenses are financed through resources outside the NDN itself. LEAs also learn about programs through awareness activities, large regional conferences which bring in a number of developers to demonstrate their programs. One is to be held in Mt. Vernon, Illinois, October 23 and 24, 1980, of which the D&U Project staff hope to be participants. Thus, local people are self-identified. Similar to responses garnered through the D&U interview activity, importance of administrative support and personality of disseminators was stressed for successful dissemination.

The NDN is in the process of formulating a system to document individuals that have participated in awareness sessions. In Illinois, an average of 300 programs are adopted per year, placing it as one of the top five adopters in the United States. The NDN does not provide followup after the adoption, feeling that as true facilitators that is not their responsibility.

The Illinois NDN is interested in directing its future efforts to fill two voids: capacity building within the state; and higher education. The NDN would like to have more adopters certified to be trainers. They feel this would cut cost and increase efficiency. Regarding higher education, they would like university personnel to conduct research on dissemination and use the idea of dissemination networks particularly in preservice training. Another concern of future efforts is telecommunications.

VII QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEYS

Two sample questionnaire surveys were designed, mailed, and preliminarily analyzed in fulfillment of Phase One objective, to evaluate the effectiveness of dissemination and diffusion strategies used in moving program improvement products from the development stage to the utilization stage. The purpose of one survey is to test the relationship between how a product is obtained and how it is used. The focus of the other survey is to test the effectiveness of various dissemination activities relative to their desired effect. A sample of each survey is included in Appendices E and F respectively.

Methods and Materials for Teaching Occupational Survival Skills (OSS) Followup Survey

The OSS

The Methods and Materials for Teaching Occupational Survival Skills (OSS) was identified in the First Phase project proposal as worthy of further study. It is a somewhat typical R&D program improvement product in Illinois both in terms of substance and method of distribution. The content of the curriculum materials appeals to a wide audience of vocational and secondary as well as college and university educators. The product was designed to be used in whole or in part, and to be adopted or adapted with little extra preparation on the part of the user. The OSS as a resource focuses on the "human" aspects of working in organizations. The guide is divided into twelve instructional modules along with a test section for student evaluation. Each module is

divided into five or more class sessions. Each session involves a highly action-oriented approach and contains the following components: (1) topic; (2) objective; (3) survival skills emphasized; (4) importance; (5) materials and equipment; (6) activity; and (7) follow-up.

The Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education invested $147,000 from 1974 through 1979 for the research, development, and dissemination of the OSS. Approximately 950 copies of the materials were originally printed in accordance with the contract between the developer, the University of Illinois, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, and the funder, the Illinois State Board of Education. These copies were distributed to agencies/networks on the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education master dissemination list and to individuals who attended the following activities at which the materials were presented:

1. Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education staff orientation
2. University of Illinois extramural classes in Chicago
3. Presentations at conferences
4. Workshops
5. Presentations to specialized groups
6. Staff development (inservice) activities

In addition to dissemination efforts by the Illinois State Board of Education and the developer, the OSS materials were selected for national distribution as one of the five Special Packages identified as part of the dissemination and utilization program at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) at the Ohio State University. Copies of the OSS were distributed along with the four other selected Special Packages accordingly:

Copies Sent	Center	No. of Centers
8	Curriculum Coordination Centers	6
1	State Liaison Representative	63
3	Research Coordinating Units	59

In addition to the original 950 copies, the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse (CPC) at Western Illinois University printed 500 copies in November 1978 for sale on a cost recovery basis ($14.95 per copy). Another printing of 750 copies was completed in April 1979. An additional 2,000 copies were printed in January 1980.

The Sample Population

By August 31, 1979, a total of 2,200 copies of the OSS had been distributed on the local, state and national level through a variety of distribution techniques. As systematic records were not kept on recipients, the D&U Project Staff faced the monumental task of collecting an optimum number of recipients' names and addresses. This experience has left its indelible imprint regarding necessity of recipient records, preferably maintained by a central authority, if responsible dissemination and followup impact is to occur.

In an effort to tap non-Illinois recipients of the OSS, D&U Project staff members, Carol Sanders and Janet Treichel hosted an informal meeting at the American Vocational Association (AVA) Convention in December 1979 to discuss OSS dissemination efforts in other states. David L'Angelle, of the NCRVE provided information on those states that had either adopted/adapted the resource or were considering its extensive use. It was learned that these states first became aware of the OSS materials through a presentation made to the RCU directors as a result of the OSS being chosen by the NCRVE as one of

five products chosen for national distribution. Phone contacts to representatives of Ohio, Arizona, New York, West Virginia and Pennsylvania were made but due to travel cutbacks it was possible to meet only with persons from Arizona and Pennsylvania at AVA. The Arizona State Department of Education ordered 75 copies of the OSS material from the CPC and requested that a presentation be made to teachers of diversified occupations. In addition to this dissemination effort, Yuma High School and Phoenix Union High School ordered four and forty copies respectively from the CPC.

The RCU director in Pennsylvania requested 11 academic and 28 vocational education teachers to review the OSS to determine if the material would be something worthy of further dissemination (See Appendix G for general comments and rating breakdown.) Three colleges in Pennsylvania ordered copies of the OSS from the CPC: Millersville State College, 30 copies; Gawgnead-Mercy College, 5 copies; and Indiana University at Pennsylvania, 10 copies.

Personal contact with the developers of the OSS, OSS project state contract administrator, directors of the CPC and the ECCMC, and the manager of the R&D section within the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education made possible the initial assembling of information on recipients from Illinois. Numerous letters were sent to both Illinois and non-Illinois recipients tracking those individuals or groups that had received multiple copies of the OSS requesting the needed information for individuals in possession of the additional copies.

A total of 1482 names and addresses of OSS recipients were obtained accounting for 67 percent of the number of copies printed and distributed. Eight hundred and nine recipients were Illinois residents. A breakdown of the mode of distribution to Illinois recipients follows:

Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse	259	32%
Conference/workshop	550	68%

Survey Design

As workshop presentations were the major dissemination thrust of the OSS, D&U Project staff chose to gather data to determine if this type of orientation to the materials made a difference in their use and to determine if further assistance would have been helpful. Workshop presentation content consisted of background information concerning the research and development phases of the project, rationale and purpose of material development, material organization, overview of module content and procedure for use. Each attendant at a workshop/presentation received a copy of the OSS materials.

The OSS questionnaire was designed to determine answers to questions pertaining specifically to the use of the OSS materials and also to probe respondent preferences pertaining to staff development. Specifically, the OSS questionnaire was designed to examine responses to the following questions:

Specific to OSS

1. How did the recipients obtain their copy of the OSS?
2. Are the OSS being utilized by the recipient? If not, why not?
3. Who on the local, regional or state level made the decision for the individual to use the OSS materials?
4. For what purpose are the OSS materials being used?
5. Which modules are being used?
6. Are the OSS materials being used by other educators, other than the recipient?
7. In which courses are the OSS materials being used?
8. What additional topics would the recipients have liked to have been included?

General

1. Who has responsibility for scheduling/determining content of inservice?
2. Is the person who has the responsibility for inservice the same person who provides the leadership for curriculum changes on the local level?

3. What times for staff development are considered to be most desirable?

4. What incentives for staff development, in addition to monetary, are considered to be most desirable?

The instrument was designed by the D&U Staff and examined by the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education Project contract administrator and survey experts for content validity. Following revision, the instrument was examined by the Survey Research Laboratory (SRL), University of Illinois, for design and format. The SRL was also consulted regarding selection of a random sample from the sample population.

Survey Return

The instrument, along with a cover letter and self-addressed return envelope, was sent to 309 individuals/agencies on February 12, 1980. A followup letter with an additional questionnaire and envelope was sent to 186 on February 18, 1980. By March 25, 1980, a total of 222 instruments had been returned for a 71.8% return rate. One-hundred and eighty were considered usable and 42 unusable. The following chart shows a breakdown of the sample and the return rate.

Sample Return	N	%
Usable Respondents	180	58.3
Unusable Respondents	42	13.6
Non-Respondents	87	28.1
Total	309	100.0%

Preliminary Analysis

The 180 usable instruments were coded for computer analysis. Programming for file documentation and statistical procedures was done using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). All computer work was performed at the Digital Computer Lab on the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign campus. Preliminary analysis of the survey has been accomplished. Analysis has and is being conducted in reference to the following research question:

> *Are the distribution activities currently practiced in the State of Illinois related to the implementation of what is being distributed?*

The independent variable is how the respondent received his/her copy of the OSS. The dependent variable is if the respondent is using or has used the OSS. Control variables which have yet to be tested include recipient's need of the product, the purpose of product use, if recipient desired technical assistance, who made the decision to use, and demographic characteristics.

Characteristics of the Sample

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents are vocational teachers. Twenty-three percent labeled themselves as administrators. Counselors and academic teachers comprise 15.3 and 10.8 percent of the sample respectively. The majority (74.8 percent) who responded to the question of what educational level they were now teaching stated secondary. The remainder were scattered among elementary, junior high, community college, adults, college, university, or some combination thereof. The sample was evenly distributed among various sized school districts measured by enrollment as reported by respondents.

Variable Descriptions

The independent variable OBTAINED, how the respondent obtained his/her copy of the OSS, reflects how the OSS were distributed. Apart from being sent

or given the materials, all distribution modes required some initiative on the part of the recipient to acquire a copy. Purchase through the CPC implies financial commitment either on the part of the recipient or agency/organization represented. Receipt through conferences and workshops (considering time and travel costs) or the ECCMC is financially ambiguous. Being given the resource implies no financial commitment on the part of the recipient. This variable has a further implication of orientation/no orientation to the product. Obtaining the OSS through conferences or workshops or the CPC on the basis of a conference or workshop are considered acquisition with orientation. Obtaining from the CPC on the basis of information being given or sent are considered acquisition without orientation. Again, borrowing from ECCMC was ambigious. This determination of orientation/no orientation was validated by the respondent through subsequent questions which stipulated orientation/ no orientation.

OBTAINED - How R obtained OSS copy	N	%
CPC from brochure	18	10.3
Sent or given	34	19.5
Conference or workshop	114	65.5
CPC after conference	5	2.9
ECCMC	3	1.7
NA/NR	6	Missing
Total	180	100.0

The majority of respondents obtained their copy of the OSS curriculum materials through attendance at a conference or workshop (65.5%). Nineteen and one-half percent were given or sent the materials.

A little over thirteen percent (13.2) bought their copy from the CPC. Of these, 2.9 had previous exposure to the materials through a conference or workshop. One point seven percent borrowed a copy from the ECCMC.

On the whole, the vast majority of the sample took initiative to receive the materials, did not pay directly for the materials, and were supplied some orientation to the materials. This skewness in the independent variable will naturally affect frequency distributions and contingency tables using dependent and control variables and so must be kept in mind when analyzing absolute frequencies in different cells.

Thirty-one point six percent of the total respondents identified themselves as having received no orientation to the OSS materials. Respondents with no orientation were offered a choice of different types of assistance. The distribution of these choices follows:

NOORIENT - No orientation, assistance liked	N	%
No Assistance Needed	24	43.6
Would Have Liked Consultant	6	10.9
Would Have Liked Group Training	9	16.4
Would Have Liked Time to Adapt	8	14.5
Would Have Liked a List of Users	8	14.5
Total	55	100.0 *

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Although a large percentage of respondents noted there was no need for assistance (43.6) the majority would have liked some type of assistance. No one type of assistance is shown to be particularly desired. (An open-ended "other" category was offered as a choice but no respondent exercised that option.)

Sixty-three point three percent of the total respondents identified themselves as having received orientation to the OSS materials. Like respondents with no orientation, a choice of different types of additional assistance were offered to these respondents. The distribution of these choices follows:

ORIENT - Orientation, further assistance liked	N	%
No Further Assistance Needed	50	43.9
Consultant	0	0.0
Group Training	15	13.2
Time to Adapt	32	28.1
List of Users	17	14.9
Total	114	100.0 *

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

A little more variation is seen in assistance desired for those respondents identified as having orientation. Although a substantial number of respondents desired no further assistance, time to adapt can be identified as the preferred additional assistance among those wishing additional assistance.

The dependent variable USE, respondents' use of the OSS, was coded into four categories: (1) using now; (2) have used but not currently; (3) not used but will; and (4) not used and will not use. Since the survey did not measure length of time used and coders were not able to second guess why the materials were used in the past but not currently, it was determined that any use of the materials (codes 1 and 2) would be considered as utilization. A little over half (55.4 percent) of the respondents used the OSS materials after receiving them. A substantial minority, however, (44.5) did not.

USE - Respondents' use of OSS	N	%
Using Now	44	25.1
Used But Not Now	53	30.3
Not Used But Will	65	37.1
Not Used and Won't	13	7.4
NA/NR	5	Missing
Total	180	100.0

A number of reasons were offered for nonuse of the materials. The distribution of these reasons follows:

NONUSE - Reason for not using OSS	N	%
Taught in Another Class	2	3.0
Not Appropriate	28	41.8
Need More Training	8	11.9
Do Not Have Time	27	40.3
Pending Admn. Approval*	2	3.0
Total	67	100.0

*This category comprises the only response to the open ended "other" category.

The major reasons given for nonuse of the materials are because the respondent found the materials inappropriate (41.8) or did not have time to use them (40.3).

Crosstabulation

A crosstabulation procedure provided the first step in analysis of the relationship between the independent variable (OBTAINED) and the dependent variable (USE). Although the two statistics chi square and Cramer's V revealed no statistical relationship between these two variables, an examination of relevant cells in a two-way contingency table hint at a practical relationship. As mentioned, given the skewness in the variable OBTAINED, which reflected how the OSS materials were originally distributed, the cells corresponding to "CPC on the basis of information from a conference" and "borrowed from ECCMC" contain such low absolute values they can be virtually disregarded. Sending to the CPC on the basis of information from a brochure also has a low N but enough to

discern a pattern. Thus, the first three categories contain the only valid cells to be analyzed. "CPC from brochure" and "given or sent" show a greater proportion of disuse (66.7 and 53.0 respectively) while obtaining through a workshop shows a greater proportion of use (60.2).

Crosstabulation of OBTAINED by USE

OBTAINED	N Row %	USE			
		Using Now	Used But Not Now	Not Used But Will	Not Used And Won't
CPC from Brochure		4 22.2	2 11.1	12 66.7	0 0.0
Given or Sent		9 26.5	7 20.6	16 47.1	2 5.9
Conference or Workshop		27 23.9	41 36.3	35 31.0	10 8.8
CPC on Conference		1 20.0	3 60.0	1 20.0	0 0.0
Borrowed ECCMC		1 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 50.0

Future crosstabulations with the variables NOORIENT, ORIENT, and NONUSE will allow D&U Project staff members to reflect on the relationship between OBTAINED and USE more thoroughly. If a relationship is shown, control variables will be analyzed. This analysis will be carried out in Phase Two of the project.

Analysis of "General" Variables

As a supplementary concern the OSS Followup Survey probed respondents' time and incentive preferences for inservice. On a scale of one to four (one

being most desirable, four being least desirable) respondents were asked to rate summer time, school time, after school, inservice days, evenings and weekends as time for staff development. Their response frequencies follow:

Time Preferences for Staff Development

Time for Staff Development	Most Desirable N	%	Desirable N	%	Undesirable N	%	Least Desirable N	%	Total N*	%
Summer	24	16.2	59	39.9	18	12.2	47	31.8	148	100
School Time	78	49.7	55	35.0	13	8.3	11	7.0	157	100
After School	6	4.4	44	32.1	47	34.3	40	29.2	137	100
Inservice Days	99	61.5	52	32.3	7	4.3	3	1.9	161	100
Evenings	3	2.1	15	10.7	42	30.0	80	57.1	140	100
Weekends	3	2.1	8	5.6	32	22.5	99	69.7	142	100

*Total N's do not add to the total number of cases sampled (180) due to no response and not applicable responses. Responses missing may include those who have not experienced that particular time to make a judgment although the question did not stipulate necessity of prior experience.

As a glance readily points out, inservice days and school time are most preferable for staff development and evenings and weekends are least preferable. Summer is also a desirable time for staff development while after school is not. The respondents were offered an open "other" category. Two persons suggested extended contract and rated that as desirable. Since strong preferences may be more important to staff development planners it is noteworthy that the same preference pattern holds when analyzing just the two extreme ranking categories.

Using the same rating scale respondents rated preferences of non-monetary

incentives offered to participate in staff development activities. All incentives, release time, board credit, and university credit, are rated as being desirable. University credit and release time are perceived as most attractive. As in the time preferences variable, an open "other" category was available to respondents. One respondent mentioned minigrants, two persons mentioned personal satisfaction, and one person wrote in job retention as desirable incentives.

Incentive Preferences for Staff Development*

Incentive for Staff Development	Most Desirable N	%	Desirable N	%	Undesirable N	%	Least Desirable N	%	Total N**	%
Released Time	71	43.8	73	45.1	9	5.6	9	5.6	162	100
Board Credit	60	38.5	76	48.7	15	9.6	5	3.2	156	100
University Credit	74	46.5	72	45.3	10	6.3	3	1.9	159	100

*Note that preferences exclude stipends or any other monetary incentive.

**Total N's do not add to the total number of cases sampled (180) due to no response and not applicable responses. Responses missing may include those who have not experienced that particular incentive to make a judgment although the question did not stipulate the necessity of prior experience.

It must be noted, however, that the question was phrased stipulating non-monetary incentive. This was done anticipating the comparative factor built-in to rankings of this kind. The desirablility of money as an incentive was assumed given by survey designers and thus not offered as an incentive believing a skewness in the rankings of the other incentives would result and not give an independent recording of respondents' preference for a particular incentive.

Processes of Dissemination Survey

Due to the lack of a data base pertaining to existing dissemination activities a questionnaire survey was designed by the D&U Project staff to test the effectiveness of dissemination activities relative to their goal (see Appendix F). The review of literature provided the theoretical basis for the development of the Processes of Dissemination urvey. The 24 Dissemination activity items on the survey instrument were developed using the DAG definition and clarification and suggestions came from all actors in the dissemination process: funders; project developers; users; and linkers. Of these 24 activities included in the instrument, six were designed for each of the four levels of dissemination as defined by the DAG. The instrument six, was reviewed by dissemination and research experts for design content, validity and format. A pilot study of the survey resulted in minor substantive and format changes in the questionnaire.

The population for the Processes of Dissemination Survey was the same as that used for the OSS Followup Survey. As the overall objective of the Processes of Dissemination Survey was to determine vocational educators' views of activities associated with dissemination, OSS recipients were an ideal population to sample. After drawing a sample of 309 for the OSS Survey (suggested by sampling experts at the Survey Research Lab) from the 1,482 available names and addresses of OSS recipients, a total of 1,173 remained. Twenty-five names were drawn for the pilot study leaving 1,148 from which a random sample of 375 were drawn.

The instrument, along with a cover letter and self-addressed return envelope was sent to 375 individuals/agencies on April 21, 1980. A followup letter with an additional questionnaire and envelope was sent to 262 on May 5.

By June 2, 1980, a total of 229 instruments had been returned for a 61 percent return rate. Two-hundred and eleven were considered usable and eighteen unusable. The following chart shows a breakdown of the sample and the return rate.

Sample Return	N	%
Usable Respondents	211	56.3
Unusable Respondents	18	4.8
Non-Respondents	146	38.9
Total	375	100.0

Preliminary Analysis

All usable instruments have been coded and computer file documentation is in progress. Analysis, which is scheduled for Phase Two of the project will seek to answer the following research questions and hypotheses.

1. For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements, what proportion of the respondents by role function has experienced the various activities?

   H_1: For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements a significant difference will exist between the proportion of the respondents by role function who have experienced the various activities.

2. For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements, what proportion of the respondents by residency categories has experienced the various activities?

   H_2: For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements a significant difference will exist between the proportion of the respondents by residency categories who have experienced the various activities.

3. For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements experienced by the respondents, what proportion of the individuals by role function perceived the activity to facilitate:

    a. spread
    b. exchange
    c. choice
    d. implementation

    H_3: For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements experienced by the respondents a significant difference will exist between the proportion of the individuals by role function whether they perceived the activities to facilitate:

    a. spread
    b. exchange
    c. choice
    d. implementation

4. For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements experienced by the respondents, what proportion of the individuals by residency categories perceived the activity to facilitate:

    a. spread
    b. exchange
    c. choice
    d. implementation

    H_4: For each of the 24 dissemination activity statements experienced by the respondents a significant difference will exist between the proportion of the individuals by residency categories whether they perceived the activities to facilitate:

    a. spread
    b. exchange
    c. choice
    d. implementation

5. Were the dissemination activities perceived as having been experienced by the respondents at the level defined by the Dissemination Analysis Group?

    $H_{5.1}$: When the dissemination activity was defined as a spread activity, a significantly greater proportion of individuals will perceive having experienced the activity at the spread level than on the exchange, choice, and implementation level.

    $H_{5.2}$: When the dissemination activity was defined as an exchange activity a significantly greater proportion of individuals will perceive having experienced the activity at the exchange level than on the spread, choice, and implementation level.

$H_{5.3}$: When the dissemination activity was defined as a choice activity, a significantly greater proportion of individuals will perceive having experienced the activity at the choice level than on the spread, exchange, and implementation level.

$H_{5.4}$: When the dissemination activity was defined as an implementation activity, a significantly greater proportion of individuals will perceive having experienced the activity at the implementation level than on the spread, exchange, and choice level.

6. Will the dissemination activities perceived as having been experienced at the level defined by the Dissemination Analysis Group be rated by the respondents as being more effective than if not perceived as having been experienced at the level defined by the DAG?

$H_{6.1}$: When a spread activity was perceived as having been experienced at the spread level, the effectiveness rating of the respondents will be significantly greater than if perceived as having been experienced at the exchange, choice, and implementation level.

$H_{6.2}$: When an exchange activity was perceived as having been experienced at the exchange level, the effectiveness rating of the respondents will be significantly greater than if perceived as having been experienced at the spread, choice, and implementation level.

$H_{6.3}$: When a choice activity was perceived as having been experienced at the choice level, the effectiveness rating of the respondents will be significantly greater than if perceived as having been experienced at the spread, exchange, and implementation level.

$H_{6.4}$: When an implementation activity was perceived as having been experienced at the implementation level, the effectiveness rating of the respondents will be significantly greater than if perceived as having been experienced at the spread, choice, and exchange level.

VIII RELATED ACTIVITIES

Janet Treichel, principal investigator for the D&U Project, was selected in December 1979 as the Illinois state trainer for the "Legislative Provisions for the Improvement of Guidance Programs and Personnel Development" project. This effort was funded from October 1, 1978, to May 31, 1980, by the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. Contractors on the project were the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE), the American Vocational Association (AVA), and the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA). This project involvement proved beneficial to the D&U Project because of its two-fold mission of disseminating materials nationwide that have been developed through research and development efforts, and working at the local level to implement programs that will improve career guidance in a wide variety of community settings. It has also given D&U Project staff members an opportunity to observe and comment on a trainer of trainers technique of dissemination.

Under the terms of the contract, selected federal and state laws and regulations were analyzed to determine how they relate to guidance and counseling. Over 200 critical competencies needed by career guidance personnel to effectively plan, support, implement, operate and evaluate a career guidance program were identified and grouped into 31 competency areas. Related competency-based training modules were developed and support documents identified. The modules were then used to train over 600 career guidance personnel across the country in small teams at the national, regional, and state levels. The

trained individuals represented diversified settings in their communities such as educational agencies, community agencies, correctional institutions, businesses, religious organizations, and community offices.

As the Illinois state trainer, Treichel attended a three-day regional training session in St. Louis, Missouri, January 18-20, 1980. Also in attendance at that meeting were 25 other persons representing 12 other Midwestern states. As a result of receiving this training, each state trainer was expected to conduct a state workshop to train guidance and counseling personnel in the effective use of existing resources and available legislative support for career guidance programs. The Illinois workshop was conducted March 24-25, 1980, at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign campus. Carol Sanders, D&U Project staff member, was selected by the Legislative Provisions Project contractors to be one of the trainees.

A sequel project, in which Treichel is continuing to serve as state trainer for Illinois, is "Guidance Team Training Program with Emphasis on Guidance for Vocations and Learners with Special Needs." This project will continue the training and implementation effort at the local level. As a result of the project, approximately forty local teams will develop and implement plans which will aid them in improving career guidance programs in various community settings. Three agencies are involved in conducting the sequel project: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education; The American Institute for Research; and the University of Missouri-Columbia.

On May 14-15, 1980, Treichel attended a national training session for the project at the NCRVE in Columbus, Ohio. It is expected that during the coming year, opportunities will exist for Treichel to work with a local team in a community in Illinois to plan and implement a program of career guidance that

will meet the identified needs of the community.

Other related activities which proved beneficial to the accomplishment of D&U Project objectives included staff members participation in conventions of the AVA and the Illinois Vocational Association (IVA). These meetings provided for not only professional development but also provided contacts and additional visibility of the D&U Project which, in turn, made visible the State of Illinois' commitment to effective and comprehensive dissemination within the State.

IX TRANSITION

A review of activities undertaken by the D&U Project in Phase One of the study provides suggestions for development of an effective, comprehensive system of dissemination for the State of Illinois and general rules of thumb to make dissemination efforts successful. Just as the activities were interrelated, suggestions derived from these activities are interdependent and, as such, will form the basis of recommendations to be submitted to the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education in the first portion of the Phase Two funding period.

Development of a Model

Before development of a dissemination model can take place, there must be agreement on a working definition of the term. The D&U Project has adopted the DAG four-level definition of dissemination. To accomodate that definition, beginning in Phase Two, the title of the Project will be simply, "Dissemination of Vocational Education Program Improvement Products."

There are a number of networks/agencies existing in Illinois which seek to facilitate the dissemination of vocational education program improvement products. Each network/agency has a number of regions, the boundaries of which are incongruent. The D&U Project will include these existing networks/agencies as an integral element of a dissemination plan for Illinois. There appears to be minimal coordination of these networks/agencies. The D&U Project will begin to address this lack of coordination in the Phase Two funding period through a network director's meeting. But, perhaps more importantly, local

educators appear to have limited knowledge of the existing networks/agencies and the services provided by them. Practitioners need to become aware of these existing networks/agencies and ways in which they can facilitate the dissemination of program improvement products which, in turn, impact on instruction and programs for students. As a starting point, the D&U Project has compiled awareness folders on these networks/agencies and in Phase Two will sponsor dissemination network awareness workshops.

Vocational education program improvement products come in many different forms and serve many different short-term goals. To think that all products can be successfully disseminated with one plan or that successful dissemination for all products implies implementation is foolhardy. Matching products with different levels of dissemination, as the grid used in the D&U Conference attempted to extricate, addresses only part of the problem. Phase One activities answered the "what" of dissemination: What are the types of research and development output? What are the different strategies and techniques used to disseminate products? What procedures are necessary to evaluate effectiveness? The D&U Project will have an opportunity to test combinations of these variables which affect dissemination efforts in Phase Two. These data will provide the comparative base from which to design a prototype model which will assist in matching products, techniques, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. In other words, answer the "how".

Together with substantive considerations of how to engage in effective dissemination efforts, the D&U Project will give thought to the specific logistics of planning and implementation of individual project dissemination plans. The following questions will be addressed: Who is developing products? What is being developed? What is the funding period? Is a dissemination plan included? Who devised the dissemination plan? Who will carry it out?

Keys to Successful Dissemination

Four actors, each with a starring role, are part of the dissemination process: funder; developer; linker; and user. A review of major Phase One activities not only supports the premise that there exists a need for a systematic approach to effective and efficient dissemination programs in the State of Illinois, but also highlights the need for cooperation, coordination, and communication among these actors. Goals and objectives of all actors need to be identified, agreed upon and acted upon. The D&U Project will seek to assist in collaboration efforts by sponsoring a number of conferences with state personnel, project personnel, and local practitioners in Phase Two of the study. The D&U Project must itself plug in with ongoing activities and the foundations of collaboration which assist in the dissemination of the dissemination prototype model.

Interviews with local educators, disseminators in the field, and dissemination research experts all rally around the expressed need for collaboration within the dissemination system. Personalities of dissemination actors, their interest and commitment, along with administrative support is essential for program change and makes a distinct difference in the countenance and outcomes generated by the program.

APPENDIX A

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bain, H. P., & Groseclose, J. R. The dissemination dilemma and a plan for uniting disseminators and practitioners. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 62, 101-103

Brickell, H. M. The local school system and change. In R. I. Miller (ed.), Perspectives on educational change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1966

Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development. Assessing vocational education research and development. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Science, 1976

The dissemination system of the Idaho state department of education. Boise, Idaho, 1978 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 163952)

Dunham, D. A nationwide vocational education program improvement network -- a coming reality. Paper presented at the State Research Coordinating Unit National Conference, Scottsdale, Arizona, April 30-May 3, 1979

Easley, J. A. Seven modeling perspectives on teaching and learning - some interrelations and cognitive effects. Instructional Science, 977, 6, 319-367

Emrick, J. A. & Peterson, S. M. A synthesis of findings across five recent studies of educational dissemination and change. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. San Franscisco, Calif., 1978 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 156109)

A first year look at the national diffusion network: Program highlights. 1975 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161865)

Fletcher, J. L. Final report of the dissemination analysis group to the dissemination policy council. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Community Development, 1977

Gange, J. The role of private philanthropy in the dissemination and implementation of educational research. In K. Goldhammer & S. Elam (eds.), Dissemination and implementation: Third annual Phi Delta Kappa symposium on educational research. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1962

Guba, E. G. Development, diffusion, and evaluation. In T. L. Eidell & J. Kitchel (Eds.), Knowledge production and utilization in educational administration. Columbus, OH: University Council of Educational Adminstration, 1968

Hall, D. C. & Alford, S. E. Evaluation of the national diffusion network: evaluation of the network and overview of the research literature on diffusion of educational innovation. 1976 (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 158377)

Havelock, R. G. Planning for innovation through dissemination and utilization of knowledge. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, The University of Michigan, 1971

Havelock, R. G. The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973

Hopkins, K. D., & Glass, G. V. Basis statistics for the behavioral sciences. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1978

Hull, W. L. Diffusion of vocational education R & D. The Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1977, II, (4), 31-38

Hull, W. L., Oldsen, C. F. Sharing dissemination responsibilities: A guide for articulating vocational education dissemination programs. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the Ohio State University, 1979

Hull, W. L., Magisos, J. H. & Singer, N. M. Research needs in diffusion, change, and information systems. Paper presented at an Invitational Conference on Research on Dissemination and Utilization in Education, University of Texas, Oct. 1978 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 164884)

The Interstate Project on Dissemination. Report and recommendations. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1976

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. Handbook in research and evaluation. California: EdITS Publishers, 1979

Kim, J. E. Diffusion of the cost-effectiveness analysis system for improving secondary vocational program management. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1978 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 164936)

Lippott, R., Watson, J., & Westley, B. The dynamics of planned change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Incorporated, 1958

Magisos, J. H. Program improvement is the purpose of dissemination. Presentation to the National Vocational Education D&U Conference. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the Ohio State University, 1979

Magisos, J. H., & Moore, A. B. Evaluation of vocational education research and development. Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1977, II, (4), 1-11

McGrath, G., Jelinek, J., & Wochner, R. Educational research methods. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1963

Miller, G. F. Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse Brochure. Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois, 1979

Myers, C. B. "Diffusion" does not equal "instructional change". Paper presented at annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Cincinnati, Ohio, Nov., 1977 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 156546)

National Institute of Education. Dissemination and resources group program plan, FY 1978. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978

National Institute of Education. 1976 Databook - the status of education research and development in the United States. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976

Nelson, R., Flexman, N., Leach, J., & Scanlon, T. Methods and materials for teaching occupational survival skills, IL: Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois, 1978

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Office of Education, National Institute of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. 1978 Dissemination forum - final report. Washington, D.C.: 1978

Office of Education, Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Federal Register, Oct. 3., 1977, 53823, 53848, 53849

Office of Education, Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Public law 94-482 -- rules and regulations, Oct. 12, 1976

Oliver, J. C. Dissemination and utilization: an imperative -- AVERA presidental address. BEACON-American Vocational Education Research Association, Special Edition, 1980, Vol. 9

RAND Corporation. A million random digits with 100,000 normal deviates. New York: Free Press, 1955

Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. F. Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press, 1971

Smith, J., Arkell, C., & Allen, C. The educational developer as change agent. Falls Church, Virginia: Dissemin/Action, 1980

Turlington, R. D. Division of vocational education dissemination and diffusion handbook. Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, 1978

APPENDIX B

Conference Summaries

Agenda

DISSEMINATION/UTILIZATION MEETING

Illinois State Board of Education
Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Research and Development Section
Sheraton Inn, Springfield, Illinois
November 27, 1979

Welcome

Introductions

Purpose of the Meeting

Round Table Discussion

Key Question: What can be done to promote more utilization and provide better technical assistance for the implementation of products that have been developed through program improvement activities?

Sub Questions for Consideration:

To what degree should materials be disseminated statewide and nationally?

Who are potential recipients?

What are the various classifications/categories of products and how should each be disseminated?

What should be the role of the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse in dissemination?

What should be the role of the East Central Curriculum Management Center (ECCMC)?

What should be the role of other activities?

Is the RFA a potential strategy for dissemination?

Should incentives be provided for workshop participation?

What kind of policy should be developed for complimentary copies?

How do we deal with accountability and impact?

What policy, if any, should be developed for releasing copyright privileges to commercial publishers?

Summary - Conclusions and Recommendations

Key Concerns Raised by Participants

1. How far do we go in terms of dissemination and utilization of funded products?

2. Do we make a long-term commitment to the dissemination of materials in order that they get utilized?

3. Should we disseminate all that is produced--the "good" as well as the "not so good"?

4. How much emphasis and support are we willing to put toward the proper marketing of good materials?

5. In addition to those products people want to obtain, there are also items that people in the local education agencies need to have.

6. Consideration needs to be given to large goals with more comprehensive activities which would mean fewer activities than are presently funded.

7. Dissemination and utilization research needs to focus on the following:

   --linkages of inservice and curriculum development
   --selection of a "need" area and the long-range planning for development and diffusion
   --dissemination of competency-based materials
   --the problem of released time of teachers, i.e., budgets, unions, etc.
   --using the evaluation system to assess impact of dissemination and utilization activities
   --development of a statewide system which links present and proposed dissemination components

Major Points

1. Priorities must be directed toward applied outcomes to upgrade local level programs.

2. Better validation of products is needed.

3. A systematic cost-effective process is needed to deliver products to local user.

Products Identified for Dissemination

1. Models (program)

2. Curriculum (specific)

3. Audio-Visuals

4. Resource Guides
5. Statistical Studies (research)
6. Public Relations Materials
7. AVTE Guidelines/Bulletins (RFP, sequential bulletins)
8. Handbooks
9. Special Population Materials
10. Professional Development Programs
11. Rules and Regulations (state plan)
12. Final Reports (projects)
13. Service Functions (process-oriented workshops)

SMALL GROUP REPORTS

Goals of Dissemination/Utilization System (Group I)

Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education Goal:

Make products that are developed or purchased with vocational education funds available to interested educators for implementation.

Research and Development Section Goal:

Provide necessary resources to make products available to interested educators for implementation.

To attain the above goals: (1) a systematic dissemination plan should be developed, and (2) guidelines for dissemination should be developed for proposal writers.

Dissemination Plan Objectives:

1. to make materials available on a loan basis
2. to make materials available for purchase
3. to provide inservice activities
4. to provide preservice
5. to provide technical assistance (two-way communication)
6. to provide information (spread)

Proposal Guidelines Objectives:

1. to include dissemination plan in RFP booklet

2. to include guidelines for evaluation of three phases of a project

   --Phase I
   --Phase II
   --Phase III dissemination plan (spread, exchange, choice implementation)
   (who, what, how, when, where)

Policy Statement Suggestions for Dissemination/Utilization System (Group II)

1. Linkages need to be established with already existing networks for product dissemination and utilization.

2. Preliminary decisions need to be made at priority setting and proposal negotiation times relative to target audiences to be reached through dissemination and utilization activities.

3. State staff should help define target audiences for dissemination and utilization plans.

4. Persons responsible for dissemination activities should be involved in the development of a dissemination plan at the time of project negotiation.

5. All project directors should receive inservice at the beginning of project funding to familiarize them with existing networks and structures for dissemination within the state.

6. Project directors engaged in product development should be provided with systematic inservice relative to the type of product being developed to insure quality control of product and process.

7. Project directors should receive assistance relative to marketing strategies during developmental projects.

8. The extent of use of each product should be assessed during the time of development and upon completion.

9. Dissemination efforts for a particular product should be spread over a period of time longer than the initial funding period as appropriate for the specific product.

10. Project personnel should inservice additional persons in the state to continue dissemination and utilization efforts after termination of the materials development and field-testing phases.

11. Existing materials should be reviewed periodically for possible renewal.

12. The reproduction function of materials should be consolidated under the responsibility of the state office.

Additional Policy Suggestions for Dissemination and Utilization System (Occupational Consultants Section)

1. A central display of sample copies of all publications from the last five years should be established. This could be used for visiting educators, consultant use in-house, new state office employee orientation, answering inquiries, etc.)

2. A Consultant Services Section file should be maintained of all publications of the last five years that have classroom applicability or teacher inservice potential. This file would be maintained in the Section with planned minimum inventories. Arrangements would be made to replenish stock by direct order to the Clearinghouse. Stock would be used for consultant activities only.

3. At least one copy of an appropriate curriculum publication should automatically be furnished each consultant of the appropriate occupational area for consultant purposes.

4. A minimum of 100 copies of the current brochure for the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse should be furnished CSS for consultant use and distribution.

5. Detailed dissemination arrangements should appear in every RFP and contract for development and printing. Dissemination arrangements should culminate a minimum of six months after final publication is received. All such dissemination arrangements for curriculum type materials should include the cooperation and participation of the CSS.

6. In order to maintain professional quality for all publications developed, printing specifications as to quality of material, size of printing, type of printing, format, etc. should be included in every RFP and contract.

7. Immediate distribution arrangements, without charge, should be included in every contract.

8. Printing specifications as to quality of material, size of printing, type of printing, format, etc. should be indicated in the contract for the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse. Modifications and/or deletions should also be forbidden without first obtaining the sanction of the Section involved.

9. In all cases where curriculum publications are developed, the contract should detail the agreement for dissemination of copies for field testing. All content specialists should be required to critique all field test copies of curriculum or teacher inservice publications.

10. A small supply of curriculum publications should be made immediately available to consultants even though the bulk of the copies are being reserved for workshops.

11. The Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse brochure should be updated more often even if it is only a supplement. These should be mailed to local department chairpersons of all vocational areas. (Teachers are not getting this information.)

12. Within 30-60 days of the receipt of a publication in the ECCMC, the demand popularity should be evaluated to determine if additional copies are warranted. There have been instances in the field where certain copies have been unavailable for over six months, particularly some media materials.

13. Career Guidance Centers should be given appropriate copies of materials.

14. Multiple copies of specified publications should be made available for workshops within two weeks with a procedure that will allow consultants to make a direct request to the Clearinghouse without going through command levels.

15. Professionalize all workshops with up-to-date media type materials and other handouts.

Grid for Appropriate Dissemination Technique for Research and Development Output

Although not pursued in depth during the meeting, a grid was briefly discussed as an initial strategy for assessing appropriate dissemination strategies for different kinds of product outputs. The grid provides for the matching of "products identified for dissemination" with dissemination levels as defined by "products identified for dissemination" with dissemination levels as defined by the NIE Dissemination Analysis Group. (See the following summary of the D&U conference sponsored by the D&U Project for further discussion and use of the dissemination grid)

AGENDA

Dissemination and Utilization (D&U) of Research and Development (R&D) Program Improvement Products
Regional Meeting
Room 322, University of Illinois Union
Urbana, Illinois
February 25, 1980

9:00 - 10:00	Opening Remarks and Overview *Illinois State Board of Education* *University of Illinois* Information Networks
10:00 - 10:15	Break
10:15 - 12:00	Identification of D&U System Priorities
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 2:30	D&U Techniques and Strategies
2:30 - 2:45	Break
2:45 - 4:00	Identification of D&U Strategies for R&D Products Wrap-up

GROUP SUMMARY

Information Networks
D&U CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
FEBRUARY 25, 1980

A compilation of individual participant responses regarding their awareness and use of agencies involved in the dissemination process is recorded on the following sample "Information Networks" form:

INFORMATION NETWORKS

INDICATE YOUR JOB TITLE N = 12

INDICATE BELOW WHETHER YOU ARE AWARE OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES AND WHETHER YOU HAVE USED THEIR SERVICES WITHIN THE PAST YEAR

	ARE AWARE		*USED SERVICES WITHIN PAST YEAR*	
	N	%	N	%
1. ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)	12	100	8	67
2. Occupational Education University Liaison Council	8	67	4	34
3. ECCMC (East Central Curriculum Management Center)	11	92	9	75
4. Illinois State Board of Education Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, Occupational Consultants	12	100	10	83
5. Educational Service Region Superintendents	12	100	8	67
6. IRDN (Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network)	11	92	7	58
7. Program Services Teams	11	92	7	58
8. Career Education Service Centers	11	92	5	42
9. Career Guidance Centers	12	100	10	83

	ARE AWARE		USED SERVICES WITHIN PAST YEAR	
	N	%	N	%
10. Special Needs Consultants	9	75	8	67
11. Regional Vocational Education Administrators	9	75	7	58
12. Displaced Homemaker Centers	8	67	1	8
13. Work Industry Education Labor Councils	7	58	2	17
14. Adult Education Service Centers	10	83	4	34
15. Centers for Educational Improvement	9	75	5	42
16. Teacher Centers	9	75	3	25
17. Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse	11	92	10	83
18. Education/CETA Linkages Project	11	92	8	67
19. Gifted Area Service Centers	9	75	3	25
20. INDICATE ANY OTHER AGENCIES YOU MAY KNOW OF				
National Center for Research in Vocational Education	1	8	1	8
National Diffusion Network	1	8	1	8
Project Progress	1	8	1	8

Note: If an agency was marked "used" but not marked "aware" on a form it was counted as both "aware" and "used".

GROUP SUMMARIES

Identification of D&U System Priorities
D&U CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
FEBRUARY 25, 1980

A compilation of individual response cards and small group prioritization follows:

As a person involved with research and program improvement outputs, you have been asked to develop a dissemination system that would effectively meet <u>your</u> needs.

What are your three (3) most important needs that this effective dissemination system would meet?

YELLOW GROUP INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE CARDS:

1. Staff development on how to disseminate
2. Continuous update of R&D activities
3. Dissemination at university level
4. Dissemination at local level
5. Information on rules and regulations
6. Current curriculum materials for classroom use
7. Awareness of R&D products
8. Adopt/adapt materials for classroom
9. Interval development of curriculum materials
10. Evaluation of curriculum
11. Assessment of community needs
12. Inservice of consulting personnel
13. Assessment of direct needs
14. Direct inservice
15. Funding as incentive (LEA)

YELLOW GROUP PRIORITIES AFTER DISCUSSING AND COMBINING

1. Dissemination Needs Assessment: Who gets what and how. Includes incentives.
2. Continuous update of R&D projects
3. Curriculum materials dissemination
4. Evaluation of R&D product to be disseminated and of dissemination process
5. Staff development on dissemination and implementation

ORANGE GROUP INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE CARDS:

1. Current list of available materials to disseminate to liaison committee
2. Storage
3. Checkout system for safekeeping and return
4. Access to take materials to local districts

5. Knowledge of different "groups" and their conferences and workshops
6. Knowledge of out-of-print, outdated, and revised materials
7. Identify target groups--know what "needs" need to be addressed
8. Match need (#7) with appropriate group on program for help
9. Establish a process of implementation
10. Travel funds - staff - community
11. Personnel
12. Time
13. Staff trained in knowledge of dissemination
14. Concise information
15. Timesaving techniques and synthesis of new materials

ORANGE GROUP PRIORITIES AFTER DISCUSSING AND COMBINING

1. Identify target groups, conduct needs assessment, match needs to appropriate product and programs
2. Collection of current, out-of-date materials
3. Staff trained in knowledge of dissemination
4. Funds, personnel, time
5. Quality control of developed products

GROUP SUMMARIES

D&U Techniques and Strategies
D&U CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
FEBRUARY 25, 1980

A compilation of individual response cards which were discussed by the small groups follows:

Recall the previous activity and your group's five priority need areas of an effective dissemination system.
Identify two (2) strategies or techniques that could be used to meet each of the five priority need areas.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE CARDS DISCUSSED BY YELLOW GROUP

A. Needs Assessment

* 1. Develop method/model to match product to recipients
2. Determine appropriate recipient motivators to encourage utilization of products, e.g. released time, course credit, RFA, board credit, technical assistance, funding, withholding funds
3. RFA money for staff
4. Illinois Problems Index (IPI)
5. LEA self-assessment
6. Questionnaire to local staff
7. Input from people in the field
8. Past 1 & 5 year evaluations, North Central, etc.
* 9. Technical assistance in assessing needs
10. Funding

B. Continuous Update

1. Local information coordinator
2. Publication workshop (mentioned more than once)
3. Multi-product dissemination with developers presenting
4. Curriculum reviews by consultants
* 5. R&D Newsletter (mentioned more than once)
6. Annotated Abstract book (annual or bi-annual)
7. Input to IRDN (computerization)

C. Curriculum Materials Dissemination

* 1. Adoptive/Adaptive/Evaluative workshops
2. Expand publicity function of WIU Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse
3. Make "Center Critiques" available to more practitioners
4. Provide inservice training on availability of materials, cost, etc.
5. Use of professional organizations
6. Use of LEA Administrators
7. Provide staff assistance to LEAs wishing to adopt specific materials
8. Funding
9. Newsletter
* 10. Computerization with comprehensive descriptors or ability to request information from central terminal and receive prompt reply

D. Evaluation

1. Conduct activities to evaluate the effectiveness of dissemination/utilization practices via evaluation of workshops, courses, recipients of R&D products, adoption/adaption. Activities to evaluate practices/products.
* 2. Expert to review and prioritize new products, new techniques
3. Local committee evaluation prior to implementation
4. Followup of users
5. Monetary incentive to field test
* 6. Provide technical assistance to LEAs

E. Staff Development

1. Workshops on dissemination and utilization
2. Inservice consultants, LEA staff
3. Special project incentives (grant writing)
4. University course on new and emerging curriculum (mentioned more than once)
* 5. Fund as a special grant or summer activity for staff development
6. Pay staff for willingness to implement new activities
7. Inservice from experts (persons who have proven success, not necessarily educators)

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE CARDS DISCUSSED BY ORANGE GROUP

A. Target Groups; Needs Assessment; Matching

1. Work with targeted audiences on similar needs eventually work with all groups - on and off site
2. Coordinate specific plans for the identified need, i.e., coordination of inservice
3. Evaluation/impact on targeted groups (research evaluation)
4. Inservice of agencies or other agencies of similar responsibilities

5. Team of agency personnel to work with targeted audiences in small group - teams from LEA
6. Compile list of current materials in catalog form to match local needs to program or product; inservice staff on program/product, content/procedures

B. Collection of Current, Out-of-Date Materials

1. Contact all agencies involved in producing and disseminating materials to collect information for catalog (continual updating)
2. Circulation system for general, as well as targeted, audiences
3. Development of product/program submitted to a clearinghouse
4. Share of information between clearinghouses
5. Survey practitioners to see what materials are most effective and most needed
6. Consultants to have materials on hand to work with LEA and leave for local implementation
7. Newsletter of new and continuing projects (statewide distribution) - who has funds (ISBE)

C. Staff Trained in Knowledge of Dissemination

1. Explore techniques of dissemination and bring in experts for staff development
2. Familiarize staff with available products/programs materials, needs of targeted groups
3. Inservice staffs, state, regional, local responsible for dissemination/ staff development
4. Dissemination plan written into each project plan and reviewed periodically with state staff/project administrator
5. Sessions on dissemination at state conferences
6. Change agents dissemination guide - strategies, techniques
7. Case studies of LEA product/program implementation
8. Self-directed, self-motivated, enthusiastic, perceptive, communicative personnel to direct dissemination process and activities; well-informed regarding products and programs available

D. Funds, Personnel, Time

1. Identify personnel, time and funds needed for dissemination purposes: state, regional, and local level
2. Make sure money is available for the adopter/adapter (user) of the innovation (mini grants)
3. Prepare budget and allocate

E. Quality Control of Developed Products

1. Prepare instrument(s)/criteria for ongoing product evaluation (formative)
2. Prepare instrument(s)/criteria for end of product evaluation (summative)
3. Panel of experts to evaluate existing materials (appropriate panel to match product)
4. Provide information regarding material validation
5. "Reader's Digest" of effective, locally developed programs

* Group chose to highlight; merits special attention

GROUP SUMMARIES

Identification of D&U Strategies
For R&D Products
D&U CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
FEBRUARY 25, 1980

Each small group concensus regarding the most effective method of disseminating the four different groups of output is recorded on the following sample strategies and products grid:

Identification of D&U Strategies

For R&D Products

R&D OUTPUTS	*SPREAD*	*EXCHANGE*	*CHOICE*	*IMPLEMENTATION*
INFORMATION				
1. Bulletins/Guidelines i.e., Document 1, State Plan	* X			
2. Public Relations Materials i.e., Brochures, Workshop Announcements	* X	*		
3. Rules and Regulations i.e., Federal Register	* X	X		*
4. Other_____				
REPORTS				
1. Research Studies			* X	*
2. Final Project Reports			* X	
3. Other_____				
MATERIALS				
1. Curriculum Materials	X	* X	* X	* X
2. Curriculum Guides	X	* X	*	* X
3. Professional Development Materials	X	* X	* X	* X
(All of these materials could be in the form of models, concepts, processes, audio-visuals, etc.)				
SERVICES				
1. Dissemination Workshops	X	* X	* X	*
2. Technical Assistance Training	X	* X	* X	* X
3. Other_____				

* = ORANGE GROUP X = YELLOW GROUP

NIE Dissemination Analysis Group definitions of levels of dissemination, 1977.

SPREAD: One-way casting out of knowledge in all its forms: information, ideas, and materials: "as though sowing seeds."

EXCHANGE: Two-way or multi-way flow of information, products, ideas, and materials as to needs, problems, and potential solutions.

CHOICE: Facilitation of rational consideration and selection among those ideas, materials, outcomes of research and development, effective educational practices, and other knowledge that can be used for the improvement of education.

IMPLEMENTATION: Facilitates adoption/adaption, installation, and improvements.

Participants
D&U CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
FEBRUARY 25,1980

Dave Belsheim
Director, Career Guidance Center
Room 202
Trading Post Building
304 North Maple Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Nancy Farr
Illinois Statewide Facilitator
1105 East 5th Street
Metropolis, Illinois 62960

Sharon Full
Occupational Consultant
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North 1st Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

John Garth
Director, Adult Education
Urbana High School
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Chuck Harwick
Superintendent, Educational Service Center
Box 340
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Hercules Kazanas
University Liaison Coordinating Committee
345 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana/Champaign, Illinois 61801

James Oettle
Director, Vocational Education
Keil Building
101 West Cerro Gordo
Decatur, Illinois 62523

Peggy O'Malley
Grant Middle School
1800 West Monroe
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Jim Rowe, Assistant Manager
R.R.#1
Monticello, Illinois 61856

Kathryn Smith
University Liaison Coordinating Committee
Home Economics Department
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

D&U PROJECT STAFF

Ronald McCage
Nona Janssen
Research and Development Unit
Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North 1st Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777
217/782-4620

Marlowe Slater
Janet Treichel
Carol Sanders
Ann Jung
University of Illinois
Vocational and Technical Education
Urbana, Illinois 61801
217/333-7228

MODIFIED VERSION SUMMARY

As mentioned, a number of invitees who had planned to attend the conference were victims of inclement weather and were unable to participate. So as not to lose their valuable ideas and responses it was suggested to send them an "at home" version of the day's activities. Modified versions were mailed to twelve persons. The list of respondents and summaries of their responses follow. A summary of the modified versions as well as the conference summary report were subsequently mailed to all respondents.

MODIFIED VERSION

INFORMATION NETWORKS

We recognize that there are several parts of the dissemination system in Illinois which serve various groups. Persons involved in the dissemination process represent a diverse population and, as such, have differing familiarity and use of agencies. We would like to assess your familiarity and past use of these agencies; do a little data gathering on what is happening right now. Please fill out the attached *Information Networks* form to help us see the big picture of where you are now regarding familiarity and use of dissemination in the State of Illinois. Remember, your response is in no way a reflection on the effectiveness of the agency or your current job responsibility.

INDICATE YOUR JOB TITLE N = 7

INDICATE BELOW WHETHER YOU ARE AWARE OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES AND WHETHER YOU HAVE USED THEIR SERVICES WITHIN THE PAST YEAR.

	ARE AWARE		*USED SERVICES WITHIN PAST YEAR*	
	N	%	N	%
1. ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)	7	100	3	43
2. Occupational Education University Liaison Council	5	71	2	29

	ARE AWARE		USED SERVICES WITHIN PAST YEAR	
	N	%	N	%
3. ECCME (East Central Curriculum Management Center)	7	100	6	86
4. Illinois State Board of Education Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, Occupational Consultants	7	100	6	86
5. Educational Service Region Superintendents	7	100	5	80
6. IRDN (Illinois Resource and (Dissemination Network)	4	57	2	29
7. Program Services Teams	5	71	3	43
8. Career Education Service Centers	6	86	3	43
9. Career Guidance Centers	7	100	7	100
10. Special Needs Consultants	6	86	4	57
11. Regional Vocational Education Administrators	6	86	4	57
12. Displaced Homemaker Centers	4	57	0	0
13. Work Industry Education Labor Councils	5	71	1	14
14. Adult Education Service Centers	7	100	2	29
15. Centers for Educational Improvement	5	71	4	57
16. Teacher Centers	4	57	1	14
17. Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse	5	71	5	71
18. Education/CETA Linkages Project	6	86	2	29
19. Gifted Area Service Centers	4	57	0	0
20. INDICATE ANY OTHER AGENCIES YOU MAY KNOW OF				

MODIFIED VERSION

IDENTIFICATION OF D&U SYSTEM PRIORITIES

The information networks activity revealed a number of agencies involved in some way with dissemination with various groups. At the present time there is no systematic dissemination system established. With that in mind we'd like you to answer the following question:

> *As a person involved with research and development (R&D) program improvement outputs, you have been asked to develop a dissemination system that would effectively meet your needs. What are your three (3) most important needs that this effective dissemination system would meet?*

1. Provide current and new textbooks, resources and supplementary materials to develop CWT program
   Information to be available quickly; inventories of data by subject matter area (two responses)
   Information on availability and targeted for appropriateness
   Names of people implementing/developing research activities

2. Make available new money for new program
   Staff development; preservice and inservice programs
   Conduct workshops to explain and demonstrate use of appropriate materials
   Information directed to target groups
   Information presented to motivate action
   Composite list of all organizations and their activities

3. Provide co-op conferences and workshops to upgrade CWT programs
   Provide for updating and availability of materials
   Demonstration sites for actual observation of activities
   Concise and complete presentation of materials (two responses)
   A description of the population served by each existing network and means of reaching that population

Note: Duplicate responses were combined only if included within the rank category.

MODIFIED VERSION

D&U TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

One goal of research and development efforts is to improve programs. You've all been involved in the dissemination of research and development program improvement products and have had different experience with different techniques and strategies. Naturally, you may have found some techniques

more effective than others or have thought of a new technique that for you would be more effective. Think back to the previous question and the identification of your *3 needs* fulfilled by an effective dissemination system:

Identify two (2) strategies or techniques that could be used to meet each of your 3 need areas.

Need One A. Textbooks for CWT program

1. Have actual copies on file in Springfield
2. Publication to CWT coordinators from Springfield or regional center

B. Information available quickly

1. Develop a quick and efficient process of gathering information
2. Develop a quick, cost-effective process for printing information to be disseminated

C. Information targeted to appropriate people

1. Identification of peoples' needs
2. Constant search for people who would benefit from materials

D. People in R&D

1. Make list of other proposal writers
2. Identify people in exemplory programs

Need Two A. New money/new programs

1. RFP's sent directly to school/program coordinators
2. Workshops to share new ideas and money

B. Information directed to target groups

1. Locate people who will use new information; "change agents"
2. Develop a system of distributing information to reach appropriate people

C. Information to motivate action

1. Information presented in such a way that desired action is indicated and easy to achieve
2. Provide positive reinforcement or reward for taking desired action

D. Activities List

1. Bi-monthly calendar of R&D dissemination activities and professional organizations' meetings

Need Three A. Conferences and workshops to upgrade programs

1. Send information directly to school/program coordinator

B. Concise and complete presentation

1. Constantly re-evaluate and review information to be disseminated for conciseness and clarity

C. Description of population

1. Prepare a description of populations served in composite form

General Remarks: "The very best way to get all information to practicing program coordinators is to establish vocational regional service centers!!! We need them!"
"...there should be established at each University...a support system for the diffusion and dissemination of R&D products similar to the Career Education Resource Laboratory at Eastern Illinois University...it was an effective way to reach preservice and inservice teachers."

MODIFIED VERSION

IDENTIFICATION OF D&U STRATEGIES
FOR R&D PRODUCTS

As the following grid shows, there are numerous kinds of research and development products. At the bottom of the page the NIE Dissemination Analysis Group definitions of the four levels of dissemination are given. Review these definitions. Perhaps different kinds of products require different methods of dissemination. Please indicate on your grid the most effective way(s) of disseminating the four different groups of output. Indicate with a check mark for each item under each of the four headings the most effective level of dissemination. Also, please feel free to include additional output within the categories and check the appropriate level.

IDENTIFICATION OF D&U STRATEGIES

FOR R&D PRODUCTS

R&D OUTPUTS	*SPREAD*	*EXCHANGE*	*CHOICE*	*IMPLEMENTATION*
INFORMATION				
1. Bulletins/Guidelines i.e., Document 1, State Plan	XXXXXX			
2. Public Relations Materials i.e., Brochures, Workshop Announcements	XXXXXX			
3. Rules and Regulations i.e., Federal Register	XXX	XXXX		
4. Other_____				
REPORTS				
1. Research Studies		XXXX	XXX	X
2. Final Project Reports	X	XX	XXXXX	
3. Other_____				
MATERIALS				
1. Curriculum Materials		XXXX	XXX	XXX
2. Curriculum Guides		XXXX	XX	XX
3. Professional Development Materials		XXX	XXX	XX
(All of these materials could be in the form of models, concepts, processes, audio-visuals, etc.)				
SERVICES				
1. Dissemination Workshops	X	XXXX	XXX	X
2. Technical Assistance Training		XXXX	XX	XX
3. Other_____				

NIE Dissemination Analysis Group definitions of levels of dissemination, 1977.

SPREAD: One-way casting out of knowledge in all its forms: information, ideas, and materials: "as though sowing seeds."

EXCHANGE: Two-way or multi-way flow of information, products, ideas, and materials as to needs, problems, and potential solutions.

CHOICE: Facilitation of rational consideration and selection among those ideas, materials, outcomes of research and development, effective educational practices, and other knowledge that can be used for the improvement of education.

IMPLEMENTATION: Facilitates adoption/adaption, installation, and improvements.

RESPONDENTS TO MODIFIED VERSION

OF D&U CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

Diane Blair
210 Buzzard Education Building
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Chuck Cole
Lake Land College
South Route 45
Mattoon, Illinois 61938

Carolyn Garth
CWT Coordinator
Urbana High School
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Charles Joley
University Liaison Coordinating Committee
Old Main
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Dorothy Lawson
Old Main
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Dan Mash
Director
Illinois Center for Educational Improvement
240 South Franklin Street
Decatur, Illinois 62523

Ellen Snowden
Illinois Center for Education Improvement
240 South Franklin Street
Decatur, Illinois 62523

APPENDIX C

Interview Form

Interviewee_____

School_____

Position_____

Date_____

Dissemination and Utilization of R&D Materials Interview Form

1. Do you receive research and development products from DAVTE?

   If so, how often?

   If so, is it selected materials?

2. If you do not receive R&D products, do you receive any notification of availability of materials?

   If so, from whom in particular?

3. Upon receipt of materials, how do you disseminate them in your district?

4. Have there been dissemination or staff development workshops conducted in your district for R&D materials?

   Have such workshops been conducted by persons within your district or by persons from outside the district?

5. Have these been requested locally?

6. What did you do to assist that effort?

7. What kinds of past dissemination or staff development efforts have you found to be most effective to facilitate the use of R&D materials? (i.e., overview, technical assistance)

   Was this sufficient?

   What additional assistance would you have liked?

8. What other kinds of dissemination and staff development strategies could be beneficial to your staff in meeting their needs?

9. Who in your district has responsibility for staff development?

10. What kinds of incentives have you used in planning and conducting inservice activities?

11. What incentives have been found to be most effective?

12. How could the materials produced through R&D efforts better meet the needs of your local district?

13. Have you ever ordered materials from the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse?

14. Have you ever requested or facilitated the request of materials from the Curriculum Management Center?

15. Have you requested and received RFA funds in your district?

APPENDIX D

Florida Site Visit Agenda

Florida Department of Education
Dissemination and Diffusion Meeting
February 4-6, 1980

AGENDA

Monday, February 4

Room 426 Collins Building

8:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Discussion on operation of the RCU and Florida Research Projects, with emphasis on dissemination and diffusion, demonstration projects; and curriculum networks, with emphasis on Florida applications.	Dr. Ferqueron Dr. McQuat Mr. Workman Dr. Crittenden
11:00 - 12:00 noon	Discussion of the DPS Dissemination Section operation	Dr. Fahs
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch	

Director's Office - J&B Building

1:30 - 4:00 p.m.	Operation of the DVE Dissemination/ Diffusion Section; D/D planning procedures; materials handling; accountability procedures; printing and reproduction	Mr. Simpson Ms. Bouie Mr. Eaton Ms. Moeller Mr. Workman
4:00 - 5:00 p.m.	VIEW, CAPS, CHOICES	Mr. Wooley and Staff

Tuesday, February 5

The Center for Studies in Vocational Education

8:30 - 12:00 noon	Discussion of the V-TECS production process; Automotive Mechanics Curriculum Materials development project; Decentralized Project; CSVE Dissemination Section activities; Florida Educators Information Service Section; and tour of facilities	Dr. Lathrop and staff
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch	

Conference Room - Region 1 Office

2:00 - 4:30 p.m.	Discussion of the role of the Regional Office and Regional Consultants in providing dissemination and diffusion inservice activities through workshops, visitations, program reviews and technical assistance	Mr. Harrell Mr. Caldwell Region 1 staff

Wednesday, February 6

Lively Vocational-Technical School

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Program visitation and discussion with teachers and administrators regarding effectiveness of dissemination activities; inservice activities; effectiveness of materials	Mr. J. Joyce Mr. R. Gill and staff
10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Return to airport	

APPENDIX E

OSS Followup Survey Instrument

For Office Use
#_____

1 - 3

Methods and Materials for Teaching

OCCUPATIONAL SURVIVAL SKILLS (OSS)

FOLLOWUP SURVEY

PART I *The following questions are specific to the Occupational Survival Skills (OSS) material. Please circle the number indicating your response unless otherwise instructed.*

1) How did you obtain your copy of the OSS material? 4

I sent for a copy from the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse at Western Illinois University based on information in a brochure/newsletter 1

The material was sent or given to me without orientation for using it 2

I attended a conference/workshop at which the material was presented and explained 3

I sent for a copy from the Curriculum Publications Clearinghouse at Western Illinois University after attending a conference/workshop at which the material was presented and explained 4

I borrowed a copy(s) from the East Central Curriculum Management Center, Illinois State Board of Education 5

Other (specify) _____ 6

2) If you did not receive orientation to the use of the material, what, if any, type of assistance would you have liked? 5

No assistance was needed 1

Individual consultant help 2

Participation in group training or assistance 3

Time to adapt OSS to my particular situation 4

Reference list of other persons who have used the material in their instructional program 5

Other (specify) _____ 6

NEXT PAGE PLEASE...

3) If you did receive orientation to the use of the material, what further, if any, type of assistance would you have liked? 6

No further assistance was needed 1

Individual consultant help 2

Participation in group training or assistance 3

Time to adapt OSS to my particular situation 4

Reference list of other persons who have used the material in their instructional program 5

Other (specify) _____ 6

4) I _____ the OSS material. *(Circle the number of the response that fills the blank.)* 7

Am currently using 1

Have used but am not currently using 2

Have not used but intend to use 3

Have not used and do not intend to use 4

If you circled numbers 1 or 2 for question 4 go on to question 6 and complete the remainder of the questionnaire.
If you circled numbers 3 or 4 for question 4 answer question 5 then proceed to question 10 and complete the remainder of the questionnaire

5) Indicate your reason for not using the OSS material. 8

The material is being taught in another class 1

The material is not appropriate to my situation 2

I need more training to use the material 3

I do not have time 4

Other (specify) _____ 5

6) Who made the decision for you to use the OSS material? 9

Self 1

Department chairperson 2

Curriculum coordinator/director 3

Building principal 4

District superintendent 5

Other (specify) _____ 6

NEXT PAGE PLEASE...

7) For what purpose are you using the OSS material? 10

Inservice instruction (staff development) 1

Preservice instruction (undergraduate or graduate) 2

Class activities (secondary or postsecondary) 3

Resource (media center or library) 4

Other (specify) _____ 5

8) Indicate the instruction modules you use during a semester. 11 - 12

Working in Organizations 1

Motivation for Work 2

Understanding Self 3

Interpersonal Relations 4

Effective Communications 5

Using Creativity at Work 6

Problem Solving 7

Authority and Responsibility 8

Leadership 9

Coping and Conflict 10

Coping and Change 11

Adapting and Planning for the Future 12

9) How many persons besides yourself are using your copy of the OSS material? 13

None 1

1 - 2 2

3 - 4 3

More than 5 4

Please indicate the positions of other persons using your OSS material.

_____

_____

NEXT PAGE PLEASE...

10) List titles of the courses in which the OSS materials are currently being used. 14

_____

_____

11) What additional topics would you have liked to have had included in the OSS material? 15

_____

_____

PART II The following questions are general and do not pertain specifically to the OSS material. (Continue to circle the number of your response.)

12) Who in your situation has responsibility for scheduling and determining content of inservice for your staff? 16

No one in particular is assigned that responsibility 1

Counselor 2

Teacher 3

Curriculum coordinator 4

Department chairperson 5

Building principal 6

District superintendent 7

Professional/staff development committee 8

Other (specify) _____ 9

13) Is the person who has the designated responsibility in question 12 the person who provides the leadership for curriculum changes that take place in your school or district? 17

Yes 1

No 2
(If no, please list the title or position of the person who provides this leadership

_____

NEXT PAGE PLEASE...

Below are possible times for staff development activities. Circle one number along the continuum indicating how you feel about each of the suggested times. Add any others and rate accordingly.

		Most Desirable	Desirable	Undesirable	Least Desirable	
14)	During the summer months	1	2	3	4	18
15)	During school time (released time) . .	1	2	3	4	19
16)	After school (3:00 - 5:00 P.M.) . . .	1	2	3	4	20
17)	During designated inservice days . . .	1	2	3	4	21
18)	Evenings	1	2	3	4	22
19)	Weekends	1	2	3	4	23
	Indicate others _____	1	2	3	4	
	_____	1	2	3	4	
	_____	1	2	3	4	

Below are incentives, in addition to monetary reward or extra pay, that are sometimes offered staff for participating in professional development activities. Circle one number along the continuum indicating how you feel about each of these incentives. Add any others and rate accordingly.

		Most Desirable	Desirable	Undesirable	Least Desirable	
20)	Released time (substitute provided) .	1	2	3	4	24
21)	Professional advancement credit (Board credit)	1	2	3	4	25
22)	College/university credit	1	2	3	4	26
	Indicate others _____	1	2	3	4	
	_____	1	2	3	4	
	_____	1	2	3	4	

NEXT PAGE PLEASE...

23) What is the enrollment of your school district? 27

Not applicable (i.e., state office, regional office, community college, college/university) 1

1 - 1,499 2

1,500 - 2,499 3

2,500 - 4,999 4

Over 5,000 5

24) What is your current position? 28

Academic teacher (specify area) _____ . . 1

Vocational teacher (specify area) _____ . . 2

Counselor 3

Administrator/supervisor 4

County or regional office personnel 5

State office personnel 6

Other (specify) _____ . . 7

25) At what educational level are you currently teaching? 29

Not applicable 1

Secondary 2

Community college 3

College/university 4

Adults 5

Alternate school 6

Other (specify) _____ . . 7

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

APPENDIX F

Processes of Dissemination Survey Instrument

110

For Office Use
_____ 1-5

PROCESSES OF DISSEMINATION

PART 1--PLEASE CIRCLE ONE ANSWER CODE FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTION.

1) Program improvement products developed through vocational and technical education research and development efforts consist of a wide variety of instructional materials, techniques or strategies, i.e., Methods and Materials for Teaching Occupational Survival Skills, special occupational curriculum materials, implementation guides, etc. Indicate below your predominant role and function for development, dissemination and use of such products.

My primary responsibility is for funding/developing vocational education curriculum materials, guides, handbooks, etc. At times I am also responsible for disseminating the products after they are produced. Sometimes I work with local districts in helping adopt/adapt materials.....1 6

My primary responsibility is to adopt/adapt vocational education curriculum materials, guides, handbooks, etc. developed by state departments or publishers to meet my needs or those of my students. I sometimes receive assistance from someone within my local school, district office, university or state office in implementing the materials. Occasionally I develop materials to meet my needs and those of my colleagues or field test materials developed by others.....2

My primary responsibility is to become familiar with vocational education curriculum materials, guides, handbooks, etc. developed by state department personnel or publishers so that I can match the product with the potential user. I introduce and demonstrate the materials and provide assistance to local education agencies in adopting/adapting the materials. Sometimes I am involved in producing or field testing the materials.....3

Other (describe)_____

_____

_____ 4

NEXT PAGE PLEASE.....

PART II--FOR EACH OF THE ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH DISSEMINATION OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PRODUCTS *please circle ONE response for Question A. If you circled a "3" for Question A (KNOW OF AND HAVE EXPERIENCED) ALSO circle ONE response for both Questions B and C.*

(Everyone Answer) *(If a 3 is circled on question A, also respond to questions B and C)*

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES	QUESTION A: Indicate the extent to which you know of or have experienced each of the following dissemination activities.			QUESTION B: If you know of and have experienced the activity, what assistance did it provide you?				QUESTION C: According to your response to QUESTION B how effective was this activity?			
	DO NOT KNOW OF AND HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED	KNOW OF BUT HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED	KNOW OF AND HAVE EXPERIENCED	BECOME AWARE OF THE PRODUCT AND ITS CONTENTS	UNDERSTAND HOW THE PRODUCT COULD BE USED	DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT TO IMPLEMENT THE PRODUCT	IMPLEMENT AND CONTINUE TO USE THE PRODUCT	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE	
2) Program improvement products advertised in newsletters and brochures sent to general audiences.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	7-9
3) Program improvement products available on a cost recovery basis.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	10-12
4) Information concerning program improvement products through ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center).	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	13-15
5) On-site demonstrations of program improvement products.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	16-18
6) Communication networks composed of program improvement product users.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	19-21
7) Demonstration of program improvement products at conferences/workshops.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	22-24
8) Panel discussions of product users at conferences/workshops.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	25-27
9) Field testing of products.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	28-30
10) Incentives for staff participating in program improvement activities.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	31-33

11) Catalogs or brochures which compare alternatives of several products.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	34-36
12) Specific materials advertised through brochures/newsletters sent to targeted audiences.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	37-39
13) Loan of materials through state or regional libraries.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	40-42
14) Matching of program improvement products to local needs.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	43-45
15) Centers to demonstrate new products and programs.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	46-48
16) Implementation of specific products based upon local needs and conditions.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	49-51
17) Continued technical assistance.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	52-54
18) Program improvement training programs tailored to match local needs and conditions.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	55-80 | BK 1-5 | DUP 6-8
19) Program improvement products advertised in professional journals.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	9-11
20) Communication between producers and users.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	12-14
21) On-site technical assistance.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	15-17
22) Examination copies of program improvement products.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	18-20
23) Choice of several products that would meet the same need.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	21-23
24) Program improvement products available through public libraries.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	24-26
25) Implementation techniques based upon local situations.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	27-29

NEXT PAGE PLEASE.....

PART III--PLEASE CIRCLE ONE ANSWER CODE FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

26) What is the method in your state by which program improvement products are implemented on the local level?

Implementation is mandated by the state office.....1 30

Implementation is mandated by a regional office.....2

Implementation is left up to the discretion of the local education agency.....3

Other (specify)_____

_____.....4

27) In what professional capacity do you spend the major portion of your time?

Academic teacher.....1 31

Vocational teacher.....2

Counselor.....3

School administrator/supervisor.....4

County or regional administrator/supervisor.....5

State office administrator/supervisor.....6

Other (specify)_____.....7

28) In what educational setting are you currently employed?

Elementary/Junior High/Secondary.....1 32

Community College.....2

College/University.....3

Adult/Continuing Education.....4

State Department of Education.....5

Other (specify)_____.....6

29) List other activities that you have found to be effective dissemination techniques.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE
THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX G

OSS Dissemination Review in Pennsylvania

Prior to meeting with D&U Project staff members at the AVA convention in December, 1979, regarding dissemination efforts of the OSS in Pennsylvania, the RCU director in Pennsylvania requested eleven academic and twenty-eight vocational education teachers to review the OSS to determine if the material would be worthy of further dissemination. The general comments and rating breakdown by the respondents follow.

OSS Curriculum
(11 Academic Teachers and 28 Vocational Teachers)

1. Are you willing to spend less time teaching technical skills in order to instruct your students in OSS?

	Academic	Vocational	Combined
Yes	7 (77)	21 (75)	28 (76)
No	2 (23)	7 (25)	9 (24)

2. Do you intend to teach OSS to your students?

	Academic	Vocational	Combined
Yes	8 (80)	24 (86)	32 (84)
No	2 (20)	4 (14)	6 (16)

3. Do you feel you need formal training on how to use OSS in your classroom?

	Academic	Vocational	Combined
Yes	1 (10)	14 (50)	15 (39)
No	9 (90)	14 (50)	23 (61)

4. Did you have any previous related experience or training in OSS?

	Academic	Vocational	Combined
Yes	5 (50)	5 (18)	10 (26)
No	5 (50)	23 (82)	28 (74)

5. Do you feel there was sexist writing or pictorial materials in the modules?

	Academic	Vocational	Combined
Yes	1 (10)	2 (7)	3 (8)
No	9 (90)	26 (93)	35 (92)

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. A teacher should be assigned to teach OSS
2. Teachers can better relate subject matter to own students than an itinerant teacher
3. Some of the material is too complicated for high school students
4. More examples are needed
5. The transparencies are much easier to understand than some of the exercises
6. Some of the modules should be taught by the co-op coordinator

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Occupational Survival Skills Curriculum

Module Reviewed 62 modules were reviewed by 11 academic and 28 Voc. Educ. teachers

Reviewer _____

Please rate the module on the points listed below:

	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent		
	1 0	2 5	3 17	4 38	5 40 %	1.	adequately covers the subject
	1 0	2 5	3 14	4 34	5 46	2.	presents accurate information
	1 1	2 6	3 30	4 40	5 22	3.	goal statements are appropriate to the content area
	1 1	2 10	3 37	4 40	5 12	4.	is motivational in type face, illustrations and visual aids
	1 2	2 5	3 25	4 40	5 27	5.	reading level (for my students) is
	1 2	2 8	3 30	4 37	5 22	6.	activities do not invade the privacy of the students
	1 1	2 3	3 23	4 31	5 41	7.	tests are suitable (for my students)
	1 2	2 1	3 22	4 35	5 30	8.	activities are manageable in my instructional area
	1 4	2 16	3 27	4 32	5 11	9.	fits well into my class instruction
	1 2	2 8	3 29	4 36	5 24	10.	meets my students' needs
TOTAL	1 1	2 6	3 25	4 37	5 30 %		